

Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)

Williams
Wise

Young (FL)
Zimmer

□ 1235

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294. I was absent because of the malfunction of my beeper. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3754, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997, NOTWITHSTANDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 473

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3754, pursuant to House Resolution 473, it may be in order at any time to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] as though it were an amendment printed in House Report 104-663 and that the time for debate be limited to 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACKARD: On page 32, at the end of line 17, add the following: (c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise to inquire of the chairman if this is the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] discussed with me and with the gentleman before?

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. This is a buy American amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3754, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material and charts.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 3754.

□ 1240

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

This bill continues the program we began last year to right size the legislative branch of government. We are trying to become more efficient with a smaller work force and by using technology wherever possible as long as it helps to do our job better.

The bill cuts legislative spending for 1997 by \$37.4 million. That continues the tone set in the 1996 bill over the last 2-year period. The size of the legislative branch has been reduced by \$262 million over the last 2 years.

We have also reduced our work force by 1,753 jobs over the last 2-year period, 726 in this year's bill alone. That is a reduction of 6.8 percent of the entire legislative branch work force in a 2-year period.

The CBO has indicated through their calculations that, if the entire Federal budget were to be reduced in the same

proportion as this committee has reduced the legislative branch budget, we would have a \$100 billion surplus in our Federal budget and it would be balanced already. We would make a \$100 billion down payment on the national debt, if all other agencies and programs were cut the same level that we have cut ourselves. This is just based on a straightforward extrapolation, but it indicates, I think, the magnitude of the efforts that we have taken in reducing the size and the cost of the legislative branch of government.

In specifics, this bill will make permanent law the 90-day prohibition on mass mailing, unsolicited mass mailing before elections. The bill also will fund the CyberCongress, in other words, the computer and telecommunications and information services of Congress. We will be spending about \$211 million in this bill in that area. That is 12.5 percent of the entire legislative budget on this whole area of information and telecommunications and the CyberCongress.

Also, in this year's bill we are completing the downsizing of the General Accounting Office by 25 percent. That is a 2-year process, this being the final year of that process.

We have also converted the permanent edition of the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a 26-volume document, to CD ROM. That will expedite the research possibilities for Members of Congress and researchers in general, and it will also save about \$1 million a year. We are also converting the congressional serial set, a 60-volume document, to the CD ROM, the electronic information process. That, too, will save about \$1 million a year.

We are also outsourcing the custodial work at the Ford House Office Building. We are conducting studies to outsource our maintenance and operational work at the powerplant, the congressional powerplant. We are also looking to privatize the Government Printing Office plant more, and the Botanic Garden.

□ 1245

We are also looking to further the public-private collaboration of the National Library Digital Program.

All in all we have made great strides in the right direction to bring about fiscal responsibility to the Congress of the United States and to those agencies that are here to support the Congress of the United States.

We also are funding the mandates in this bill; that is, the COLA's for staff, salary and the benefit packages for staff and Federal workers in the Congress. And that, I think, is a must.

We are also funding the 1997 inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol, the joint inaugural committee, which we must do every 4 years after the election of a new President.

All in all we are very proud of this bill; we think it moves in the right direction.

Laster on today we will be hearing amendments, one of which is to cut

this bill by almost 2 percent, 1.9 percent. I urge the Members of Congress to realize that this bill already makes major cuts, and has over the last 2 years. No appropriations bill has cut to the level that the legislative branch has cut themselves. It would be irresponsible, I think, to cut ourselves across the board. That would include books for the blind, that would include the staff, the cost of staffing our offices. It would include the CyberCongress, it would include the police, the physicians, and every phase, every part, of this bill would be cut by almost 2 percent after we have already cut ourselves over the last 2 years by almost 12 percent, and that is 12 percent of the dollar amount of the 1995 budget year.

Mr. Chairman, it would be absolutely irresponsible, I believe, for us to inflict

upon ourselves further cuts when we have set the pattern for cutting back the size of government. And, frankly, it would hurt deeply the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, which has accepted a 25 percent cut already over the last 2 years. To ask them to absorb another 2 percent cut again would be a bad-faith effort on the Congress after I have negotiated with the General Accounting Office to work toward this 25 percent. It would be, I think, catastrophic, and I would hope that all Members of Congress would resist this amendment of across-the-board cutting of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to the new ranking member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON]. He has been a member of the committee and been an extremely active and

very, very faithful member of the committee. He has now moved to become the ranking member, and it is a great pleasure on my part to work with him. He has been a great help in crafting this bill and been very supportive of the general efforts that we have tried to make in this bill, and it is a pleasure to work with him.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] who is the former chairman of this subcommittee, but also the former ranking member. He has been a great help over the years in this bill, and I wish to thank him for his cooperation.

Under leave I have already obtained, I would like to insert a tabulation of the amounts in the bill:

FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	1,478,000	1,621,000	1,535,000	+57,000	-86,000
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,470,000	1,561,000	1,526,000	+56,000	-35,000
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	1,480,000	1,574,000	1,534,000	+54,000	-40,000
Office of the Majority Whip	928,000	976,000	957,000	+29,000	-19,000
Office of the Minority Whip	918,000	963,000	949,000	+31,000	-14,000
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities	376,000	385,000	376,000	-9,000
House Republican Steering Committee	664,000	681,000	664,000	-17,000
House Republican Conference	1,083,000	1,146,000	1,130,000	+47,000	-16,000
House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,181,000	1,211,000	1,181,000	+10,000	-20,000
House Democratic Caucus	566,000	616,000	603,000	+37,000	-13,000
Nine minority employees	1,127,000	1,155,000	1,127,000	-28,000
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	11,271,000	11,889,000	11,592,000	+321,000	-297,000
Members' Representational Allowances					
Expenses	360,503,000	398,898,000	363,313,000	+2,810,000	-35,585,000
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations) ..	78,629,000	80,524,000	80,222,000	+1,593,000	-302,000
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	18,945,000	18,430,000	17,560,000	+635,000	-850,000
Subtotal, Committee employees	95,574,000	98,954,000	97,802,000	+2,228,000	-1,152,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	13,807,000	15,370,000	15,074,000	+1,267,000	-296,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	3,410,000	3,889,000	3,638,000	+228,000	-251,000
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	53,556,000	70,464,000	55,209,000	+1,853,000	-15,255,000
Office of Inspector General	3,954,000	4,048,000	3,954,000	-94,000
Office of Compliance	858,000	-858,000
Transfer to new Office of Compliance	-500,000	+500,000
Office of the Chaplain	126,000	128,000	126,000	-2,000
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,180,000	1,036,000	1,036,000	-144,000
Office of the Parliamentarian	(775,000)	(713,000)	(713,000)	(-62,000)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(405,000)	(323,000)	(323,000)	(-82,000)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	1,700,000	1,817,000	1,767,000	+67,000	-50,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	4,524,000	4,763,000	4,687,000	+163,000	-76,000
Other authorized employees	837,000	1,000,000	788,000	-69,000	-232,000
Former Speakers ¹	(666,000)	(825,000)	(594,000)	(-72,000)	(-231,000)
Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician	(171,000)	(175,000)	(174,000)	(+3,000)	(-1,000)
Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees	83,452,000	102,515,000	86,259,000	+2,807,000	-16,256,000
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	994,000	2,301,000	2,374,000	+1,380,000	+73,000
Official mail (committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Reemployed annuitants reimbursements	68,000	71,000	71,000	+3,000
Government contributions	117,541,000	122,508,000	120,779,000	+3,238,000	-1,729,000
Miscellaneous items	658,000	641,000	641,000	-17,000
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	120,261,000	126,521,000	124,865,000	+4,604,000	-1,656,000
Total, House of Representatives	671,061,000	738,777,000	683,831,000	+12,770,000	-54,846,000
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1997	950,000	950,000	+950,000
Joint Economic Committee	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Joint Committee on Printing	750,000	777,000	777,000	+27,000
Joint Committee on Taxation	5,116,000	7,716,000	5,470,000	+354,000	-2,246,000
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	1,260,000	1,225,000	1,225,000	-35,000

¹ For FY 1996 and previous years, non-personnel expenses for this item were included under "Allowances and Expenses, supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims". Beginning in FY 1997, these expenses have been consolidated under "Salaries, Officers and Employees, other authorized employees". The FY 1996 enacted amounts have been adjusted to reflect the revised funding consolidation.

FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Capitol Police Board					
Capitol Police					
Salaries:					
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.....	34,213,000	37,286,000	32,927,000	-1,286,000	-4,359,000
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	35,919,000	39,106,000	35,485,000	-454,000	-3,643,000
Subtotal, salaries	70,132,000	76,394,000	68,392,000	-1,740,000	-8,002,000
General expenses.....	2,560,000	7,806,000	2,685,000	+125,000	-4,921,000
Subtotal, Capitol Police	72,692,000	84,000,000	71,077,000	-1,615,000	-12,923,000
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office	1,991,000	1,991,000	1,991,000		
Statements of Appropriations	30,000	30,000	30,000		
Total, Joint Items.....	84,839,000	99,689,000	84,520,000	-319,000	-15,169,000
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000	3,268,000	2,609,000	+609,000	-659,000
Transfer from House of Rep. Office of Compliance	500,000			-500,000	
Total, Office of Compliance	2,500,000	3,268,000	2,609,000	+109,000	-659,000
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,615,000			-3,615,000	
Reappropriation.....	2,500,000			-2,500,000	
Total, Office of Technology Assessment.....	6,115,000			-6,115,000	
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	24,288,000	24,775,000	24,288,000		-487,000
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Office of the Architect of the Capitol					
Salaries	8,569,000	8,714,000	8,454,000	-115,000	-260,000
Travel (limitation on official travel expenses).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		
Contingent expenses.....	100,000	100,000	100,000		
Subtotal, Office of the Architect of the Capitol	8,669,000	8,814,000	8,554,000	-115,000	-260,000
Capitol Buildings and Grounds					
Capitol buildings.....	22,882,000	23,679,000	23,255,000	+373,000	-424,000
Capitol grounds	5,143,000	5,020,000	5,020,000		-123,000
House office buildings.....	33,001,000	32,556,000	32,556,000		-445,000
Capitol Power Plant	35,518,000	34,749,000	34,749,000		-769,000
Offsetting collections	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000		
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	31,518,000	30,749,000	30,749,000		-769,000
Subtotal, Capitol buildings and grounds	92,544,000	92,004,000	91,580,000	-964,000	-424,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	101,213,000	100,818,000	100,134,000	-1,079,000	-684,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Congressional Research Service					
Salaries and expenses.....	60,084,000	63,056,000	62,641,000	+2,557,000	-415,000
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding.....	83,770,000	83,770,000	81,669,000	-2,101,000	-2,101,000
Total, title I, Congressional Operations	1,033,870,000	1,114,153,000	1,039,692,000	+5,822,000	-74,461,000

FY 1997 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3754)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES					
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,053,000	2,902,000	2,902,000	-151,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses.....	211,884,000	226,235,000	215,007,000	+3,343,000	-11,228,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-7,889,000	-7,889,000	-7,889,000
Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	203,795,000	218,366,000	207,138,000	+3,343,000	-11,228,000
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	30,818,000	34,566,000	33,402,000	+2,584,000	-1,164,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-19,830,000	-22,278,000	-22,269,000	-2,439,000	+9,000
Net subtotal, Copyright Office.....	10,988,000	12,288,000	11,133,000	+145,000	-1,155,000
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses.....	44,951,000	46,057,000	44,964,000	+13,000	-1,093,000
Furniture and furnishings.....	4,882,000	4,882,000	4,882,000
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS).....	264,816,000	281,593,000	268,117,000	+3,501,000	-13,476,000
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Library Buildings and Grounds					
Structural and mechanical care.....	12,428,000	9,003,000	9,003,000	-3,425,000
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Office of Superintendent of Documents					
Salaries and expenses.....	30,307,000	30,827,000	29,077,000	-1,230,000	-1,750,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	382,806,000	377,773,000	338,425,000	-44,381,000	-39,348,000
Offsetting collections.....	-8,400,000	-6,100,000	-5,905,000	+2,495,000	+195,000
Total, General Accounting Office.....	374,406,000	371,673,000	332,520,000	-41,886,000	-39,153,000
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	684,810,000	695,998,000	641,619,000	-43,191,000	-54,379,000
Grand total.....	1,718,680,000	1,810,151,000	1,681,311,000	-37,369,000	-128,840,000

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying how much I have enjoyed the privilege of working with the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It has truly been a bipartisan effort. We have tackled a difficult task, and we have come through it with a very austere recommendation which we bring to the floor of the House in the form of the legislative appropriation bill. If every other agency in Government as the chairman said, had done the same degree of cutting that the legislative branch has done, we would have a Federal budget surplus today in the United States.

This effort did begin under the chairmanship of my colleague from California, Mr. FAZIO, who in 1992 instituted a program for the reduction of FTE's for the legislative branch. As a result of continuing that policy under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], we have reduced more than 5,500 employees of the Federal legislative branch of Government.

I also want to join my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], in opposing a further across-the-board cut of 1.9 percent. Such a cut would decimate many of the activities of the legislative branch, and the legislative branch of Government has serious responsibilities of oversight to check and balance the operations of the executive branch and of the judicial branch. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment when it comes before the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is an exemplary bill. It is not a perfect bill. We have cut areas where I personally would rather have not seen us cut. I was very saddened last year when the Office of Technology Assessment, which was instituted under the Presidency of Richard Nixon and supported for all the years in between, was brought to an end. But it was one of the cuts that had to be made in order to bring the legislative branch to this meeting today having already accomplished its entire goal in 2 years of reductions needed to reach a balanced budget in 7 years.

I commend the subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, for their work.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] who serves on the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this appropriation bill. It has been a pleasure to serve on this particular subcommittee because we have accomplished what our goals have been, which are reducing the size and scope of the Government and reducing the

amount of money we spend here in Washington.

This bill sends an immensely important signal to our constituents back home. Our efforts to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government starts with ourselves, and for the second year in a row we cut the taxpayer burden of running Congress.

This bill is significant because it continues to build on the successes previously achieved. We not only continue to cut spending, but we also continue to bring the House of Representatives into the 21st century.

In this subcommittee last year we cut over 9 percent from the legislative branch appropriation. This is \$154 million that we saved the American taxpayers, and that is a very significant contribution. If every subcommittee had been able to cut their budgets proportionately, as the previous speaker said, the Federal budget would show a surplus today.

The decisions for cutting last year were not easy. We had to eliminate certain agencies that outlived their usefulness and remove many of the perks that have become institutional here in Congress. This bill continues the momentum that was established last year by cutting an additional \$37.4 million, a reduction from last year of 2.2 percent. The committee goes further than any other appropriation committee in the House. Once again we have undertaken a review of how to reduce the costs of operating Congress to demonstrate our commitment not only to cutting spending but also learning how to spend our tax dollars wisely.

While we have cut the cost of Congress, we have also moved into the 21st century and made this a more efficient institution. The importance of this year's legislative branch bill extends beyond merely the funding issue. Within the bill are several provisions which embody much of the new congressional spirit, proposals for privatizing, streamlining and modernization.

One example is the report language requesting a study of the possibilities of privatizing or transferring the botanic gardens. I understand there is a lot of support for the gardens here in Congress, but why should Congress be running this agency? It should be transferred out of the Congress budget into Agriculture. We have the arboretum and other areas that can address this issue very effectively. So at least we are asking for further study of what to do with this.

Another proposal that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has requested is for the Chief Administrative Officer to review other ideas for privatizing various functions. Many other agencies and departments and businesses have privatized their in-house services from payroll to cleaning with great success.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] that it is time for the Congress to become competitive and look for cost-effective

ways to provide the most basic services.

Additionally, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] once again promotes modernization. Bill language compels the Government Printing Office to reduce the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, instead of printing them in bound copies, to use CD-ROM copies. We would continue to produce a limited number of printed copies, but now we can make available on CD-ROM the entire CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This would provide significant space and savings in both time and space.

Just think. Instead of having to pull down from the shelf a large bound volume and have to read through to find a passage, we can just put a disk in the computer and do a word search to find what we are looking for.

What we have here is a balanced bill which embodies much of the spirit of the new House of Representatives. We continue to reduce the level of expenditures within this account. We move to privatization and streamlining many of the functions of Congress which we have promoted in other government agencies. As we begin the process of modernization, which like all the changes takes time but reaps great rewards, it has been an honor to serve on this committee, and I commend our chairman for his insight and diligence and urge support of my colleagues for this bill.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time, and I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Subcommittee if he is agreeable.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, during the full committee markup of this bill the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] offered an amendment from me which called for an independent evaluation of the General Accounting Office's processes and procedures, building upon previous independent reports that have compelled important changes at the Agency. The amendment failed, but since then the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I have had a chance to talk further about this study and reached an understanding.

Specifically, I am concerned about the procedures that GAO uses to vet its reports to begin congressionally requested studies and to gauge its success. The independent study would

have taken an outsider look at these insider's processes to suggest needed improvements.

In addition, GAO has undergone a rapid period of change, including significant downsizing and restructuring. As the Agency evolves further, outside advice could prove very useful to the Agency in its leadership. It is a very important arm of the Congress and should be supported. However, there are important problems, and I believe the chairman shares these concerns.

Mr. PACKARD. I do, Mr. BROWN. I do share the gentleman's concerns, and I also understand and recall the amendment that was offered, and I believe the amendment was offered in full committee with the best interests of the GAO and the new Comptroller General in mind.

However, I am concerned that a study performed now before the new Comptroller General is appointed, which should be later this year, would interfere with the ability of that person to institute their own reforms in the Agency. In deference to the new Comptroller General, whoever that may be, I did ask the gentleman from California to withhold his amendment today. After the new Comptroller General is appointed, we will discuss with him or her whatever studies may be useful. If such a study remains useful for the Agency in the Congress, I would gladly join with the gentleman to invite a reprogramming of funds for that purpose.

In addition, a new Comptroller General has not been appointed, and if the subject of the independent study has not been addressed by the time the subcommittee prepares the legislative branch appropriation bill for next year, then I will re-examine this request from the gentleman.

In the meantime I would gladly work with the gentleman to try to resolve any problems at the Agency and again will cooperate in every way I can.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his statement. In deference to his judgment I will not offer my amendment at the appropriate time. The gentleman and I would both like to see a strong GAO operating with an unparalleled standard of excellence, and I look forward to working together with him to reach that goal.

□ 1300

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about what is not in this bill and not in the rule, rather than what is in it. What ought to be on the floor this afternoon would be an amendment to end cyber censorship in the House, to end the restriction on information available to the American public about the work and positions of the minority members of the House's committees.

Unfortunately, a decision, an absolutely incredible, astounding, un-American decision, was taken by the House Reform Committee back in May that puts the majority here in control of information flow about the activities and positions of the minority members of House committees.

I know that may be impossible for rational, reasonable Americans to believe to have happened in this home of democratic principles and traditions, the people's House. It is absolutely un-American. It should offend our basic sense of fair play, that the American public cannot get to information about what the minority in this place is doing without passing through gates that are kept and controlled by the majority, and which can essentially be shut so that you cannot find out what you may need to know about major activities of your U.S. Congress.

If this happened anywhere else in this country, other than being buried in the House rules, it would be a patent, patent violation of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. But because we have a special status under the Constitution and one that is clearly subject to our own abuse, we can impose this kind of censorship on ourselves, and then put it off limits by not permitting a rule today that would even enable us to debate and vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, we should have had that opportunity because, in good faith and good will, we believed when we debated this bill in the full Committee on Appropriations that such an amendment would be made in order, if this issue were not earlier resolved. The assurances that were offered in full committee and that prompted the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] to withdraw an amendment at that time, have not been kept, unfortunately.

So here we are today in this predicament, unable to have a vote on an issue that goes to the absolute core values of any democratic institution and any democratic process.

This is not just a passive matter, either. Evidently the HIR, House Information Office, has been directed to so engineer access to web sites, Internet sites for the House, that users from the outside will not even be able to put what is called a bookmark on a particular site so they can get back to it the next time without having to go through all the rigamarole that the majority feels it is appropriate to put in the way of, again, access to information.

Mr. Chairman, does anyone here really believe that the American people, the American public, should not have free and equal access to both majority and minority points of view? Does anybody believe minority committee members should not be able to get their thoughts and positions before the American public without this form of direct and indirect censorship being put in the way?

I truly do not understand how we could have gotten into a situation like

this. It is absolutely insulting to the integrity and the intelligence of Members of those body as well as the American people.

For all of the proud rhetoric that we got from the majority about an open Congress, an open process, a free flow of information through cyberspace, that is now shown to be a cynical and empty promise. This is an extremely disappointing performance by our colleagues on the majority side, an absolute insult to democratic traditions and principles. We should be ashamed to see it stand.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about what is in this bill. Coming from Silicon Valley, I have very strong concerns about what is not happening with technology and how we are very foolishly trying to censor ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I got the information about the CyberCongress, and that we were all going to get a computer. Mine arrived at my office 6 months late, and what we did was we called just a regular vendor out of the phone book, not anybody politically connected. They will sell these machines to us for \$900 less than we paid for them and they will deliver them in 4 days. So we are going to spend \$400,000 more on these computers than we needed to spend. It makes me very suspicious, I will say that. It makes me very uncomfortable.

I am also concerned that for those of us who use the Internet frequently, as I do, one of the things you cannot get from the CyberCongress is the voting records, how we voted every day. You can get extension of remarks, you can get tributes to Little League coaches, but you cannot find out how your Congress Member voted on the Internet. I have introduced a bill to require us to post that information. It has not had a hearing. It seems to me if we can print votes every day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they ought to be posted on the Internet too. I think this bill should address that.

Finally, I want to talk about web pages the previous speaker mentioned before. I just came back here from some time at home. Everywhere I went, my constituents and neighbors would say, "Do they not get it back there? Do any of them use the Internet?" I had to say, actually, probably they do not get it. I think the new policy on web pages is proof that the leadership of this body does not get it yet. To suggest that for security reasons, which is ludicrous, that the URL has to be only with the majority instead of the minority is foolish indeed.

Mr. Chairman, what has really evolved here is not only censorship, which Americans object to. Technologically it is foolish. Ultimately, to try to prevent web users from actually accessing minority web pages is a very bad precedent, and technically, in the end, I think it will fail. We would not

suggest that it is OK to prohibit Members of Congress from issuing a statement, from putting a differing point of view in writing and sending that to other Americans. That is what this policy on web pages does. I object to it strongly, and I hope we will be able to change the current policy on minority web pages administratively or through this bill. I think there should be an amendment allowed to deal with it, and I hope that when I go home next, I can say yes, they finally got it here.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute simply to respond to the last two speakers.

It is the Committee on House Oversight that has jurisdiction over the operations of the cyber Congress and the information services, and also has jurisdiction over the web page. This is not the vehicle, the bill, that should be used to establish those kind of legislative policies. That committee has dealt with these things and is continuing to deal with them, and to put it in this bill would fly in the face and really be offensive, I think, to the authorizing committee. That is why we have resisted putting those items onto this bill. It would simply be inappropriate.

If the committee had agreed to the web page, the committee of jurisdiction, then we would, at their instructions, put it in the bill. But for us to put it in our bill over the objections of the authorizing committee I think would not be appropriate.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a gentleman of great integrity and who does appreciate the technical rules of the House. Indeed it would be difficult to bring the amendment, which would correct the terrible abuse of lack of direct Internet access, to the floor on this bill. However, the Committee on Rules has allowed other bills which legislate upon an appropriations measure to come before the House, and this is the only way an appeal could be made to the full House in this policy.

I do recognize that the chairman has a great tradition on his side in not wishing to offend the authorizing committee which dealt with this, but I think that in this instance it would have been a very appropriate and fair thing for the Committee on Rules to allow the House as a whole to vote on the question of access to Web sites.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This is an important matter in terms of adequately funding the resources and staff we need to competently do our work. Quite frankly, it is evident from some of the products coming out of the Oversight Committee in terms of policies dealing with the web site that they are not doing their job in a competent and bipartisan manner.

It is an egregious action that was taken on a partisan matter which pro-

hibited or prevented direct access by the minority committees to in fact have access through the Internet by our constituencies. In fact, as late as May 28, several committees, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means, did not even have a web site. By virtue of that, the minority was precluded from access to the Internet, while the Republican majority caught up.

In fact, the majority had gone through the initiative in terms of providing a web site on the Internet from the Democratic Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and were in fact subsumed by the Republican majority committee by virtue of the Oversight Committee rule. Now in order to get access to that Democratic minority web site you have to go through the Republican material, wonderful photograph of our chairman, and you have to go through a lot of other window dressing in terms of explanation as to what is going on. As the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, you may not even put an electronic bookmark in place, so once you have done that, you could gain access again. That would obviously be helpful—but certainly the issue goes beyond that point.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be censoring, the House should not be censoring the speeches of Members on this floor, nor should they be censoring the information on the Internet that is providing direct access and communication on a democratic basis. We should not be afraid of the competition of ideas in this Congress and expressing those and sharing that information on the Internet. Yet, that is what this action has achieved—our constituents can only achieve access to minority views and news in the context that the Republican majority deems appropriate.

What are the GOP Members afraid of in terms of communication in this sense? We talk about the Internet in terms of various other improper materials, and the courts have held those limits improper. It is not a matter of space, it is not a matter of security, it is a matter of GOP censorship of the minority Democratic views on these web sites. This substantive amendment is not being permitted to be offered on the floor today, and this Congress has repeatedly provided for authorization legislation on appropriations bills and riders that go far beyond this point, and there is no other opportunity to vote on this subject to be addressed by a vote of the full House.

Today we have to take a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] which tries to transfer some money. I hope Members will rise to vote for that and send a signal, at least, to the Oversight Committee in terms of the abuse that is going on, that this decision and limit is inappropriate and uncalled for.

The fact is that we have to go through what really amounts to cen-

sorship and editorializing by the GOP majority of the Democratic minority views. I think that this is wrong, it is patently wrong to have moved in this particular direction. This bill would be the proper vehicle, this legislative appropriation measure, to in fact deal with that issue, but it has been rejected by the Committee on Rules, again on a partisan basis.

I appeal to my colleagues to vote for and support the Fazio amendment, and at least symbolically to deal with this issue of GOP once more trying to control the voices of dissent in this House in such an inappropriate manner.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to beat this subject to death, but I think we really have to understand what we are talking about here. The new way that this Congress and everyone in this country will put forth information is through the Internet. Right in this Hall today, in the Capitol today, throughout Washington, DC, there are young people, for instance, who are visiting during summer vacation. These young people will go back in September and begin school once again. More and more every day they get their information through the Internet.

One of the things that I tell people about my web page is that I want to reach a point where they can get as much information about government as possible from the Library of Congress to the Smithsonian to local institutions in my district to how I vote and how I think and what I feel about certain issues. To now tell people that they can visit the majority party but that they have no access to the minority party on its own with a different view is really from the beginning of this procedure to set out censorship rather than freedom. What kind of a message are we sending? This is totally improper.

The best way to see what this is like is to look at it this way. Imagine if visitors were allowed to visit the chairman of the committee but were not allowed to visit the office of the minority leader of the committee. They visit the chairman but they are not allowed to visit the other person, and if they are going to speak to that ranking member, they have to speak to them in the presence of the chairman. They cannot exchange views on a private and separate basis. That is what we are talking about.

Rather than doing this, we should be thinking about the future. I would like to see the day when the Internet for the House of Representatives personally reaches out to the world, not only in English but in different languages, so people could learn about us, learn about our democracy, read about us. How nice it would be if Latin American countries and students could read in Spanish about the House of Representatives of this, the greatest democracy

on earth. Instead of thinking about that, you are saying no, you cannot put your words out, and if you put them out you have to check with us first.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of this amendment and I commend my colleagues from Michigan, Mr. SMITH, and Indiana, Mr. ROEMER, for offering it.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of streamlining and working more efficiently, I returned \$100,000 from my 1995 office budget back to the Treasury Department for reducing the deficit. Combined with similar cost savings in 1993 and 1994, I have returned a total of \$500,000. I am very proud of this record.

However, without the language of this amendment again added to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, the tax dollars I and other Members save from the efficient operation of our offices could not be returned to the Treasury. Instead those savings would be reallocated to other spending priorities.

Thus, I was pleased to have been a cosponsor of last year's successful amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, and I am pleased to join again this year.

Mr. Chairman, we need to send a message to the American public that Congress is working more efficiently and with greater accountability. And just as we ask other agencies of Government, Congress needs to reduce spending and make its contribution to reducing the deficit.

Vote for the Smith-Roemer-Harman-Zimmer-Klug-Goss-Browder-Minge and Camp amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for the legislative branch appropriations bill before us. I have enjoyed working with Mr. PACKARD on this bill, as well as the other members of the subcommittee. We are tasked with an important, but often anonymous role, that of drafting the legislation that allows our branch of Government to function effectively. This measure continues the spending reductions begun in past Congresses and deserves our support.

Since fiscal year 1992, Congress has reduced total legislative branch staffing by 5,500 full-time equivalent positions—a reduction of nearly 20 percent. While these cuts are necessary to reduce bloated staffing and inefficient operations, we must not reduce spending merely for the sake of reduction.

The Congress, as a coequal branch of our Government, is charged with a fundamentally important mission. Without adequate resources to check and balance the other branches, we are abdicating this constitutionally mandated responsibility.

This bill contains an appropriation of \$1.68 billion for congressional operations and related agencies. I am pleased that operating funds for the House of Representatives have been increased under this bill to \$683.8 million and that committee staffing has been held at current levels. The overall reduction of \$37 million in this year's bill is financed from the reduction to the GAO to fulfill a staffing reduction commitment of the Comptroller General.

While I am generally pleased with this year's bill, I remain troubled by the restrictive Internet policy adopted by the House Oversight Committee. The policy would require all Internet and World Wide Web users to access information on Democratic Committee Web page counterparts.

There are good reasons for a Web page policy, but I believe that the policy decided upon by the chairman of the Oversight Committee unnecessarily restricts the free flow of information so vital to our democracy. For example, if the Republican leadership of a given committee refuses to create, or decides to terminate, its home page, the Democratic minority must automatically follow suit.

I find it ironic that the other party—which has received so much credit for instituting an information-based “Cyber-Congress”—would make the first congressional policy regarding the Internet such a restrictive one. The World Wide Web is a forum for communicating information of every conceivable type. It is the “town crier” of the 21st century. To bury the valuable committee information of the minority party beneath pages of photos, biographies, and press releases from the majority party flies in the face of an open Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fazio amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This amendment attempts to revisit action taken in the Appropriations Committee that deserves the light of full debate.

The majority has brought this appropriations bill to the floor with an onerous provision that restricts public access to congressional information. Most House committees have both majority and minority Web sites that the public can access to seek legislative information, committee schedules, and other relevant committee material. Since these sites first went on-line, they have been accessible to the public without restriction. The Republican majority would like to see this changed.

The same majority that claims to have a commitment to a “cybercongress” and the information infrastructure has placed limits on what information the public can access. They want to make all committee home pages controlled by the majority. The public will not be able to read the minority information without reading the majority information first.

This is not the way to open up Congress to an ever-increasing electronic electorate. By limiting the information the public can access, the Republican majority is blocking freedom of speech, and limiting debate on issues the public has a right to be informed about.

The minority, regardless of party, has a right to be heard. It is not a question of Republican versus Democrat, it is a clear question of what the public has a right to read.

The committee refused to hear an amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO in committee that questioned this arrangement, and then claimed that since it was a regulation and not a law, that the committee need not discuss the provision. Last night the Rules Committee made a similar amendment by Mr. FAZIO out of order.

What are they afraid of? Individuals should be able to realize their freedom to access information, and the Republican majority should not define the way in which that information is available. What happens if a committee chairman decides not to put up a Web page, the minority is automatically cut off from the Internet? This is our Nation's highest democratic body, but this process is anything but democratic.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and support a free and open government.

□ 1315

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of H.R. 3754 is as follows:

H.R. 3754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$683,831,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$11,592,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,535,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,526,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,534,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$957,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$949,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$376,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$664,000; Republican Conference, \$1,130,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,191,000; Democratic Caucus, \$603,000; and nine minority employees, \$1,127,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

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

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$363,313,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$80,222,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$17,580,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$86,259,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than \$3,500, of which not more than \$2,500 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, \$15,074,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and

including not more than \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,638,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$55,209,000, including salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Resources, \$22,577,000, of which \$16,577,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That House Information Resources is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,954,000; Office of the Chaplain, \$126,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,036,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,767,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,687,000; and other authorized employees, \$768,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$124,865,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$2,374,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$1,000,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursement, \$71,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$120,779,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, inter-parliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$641,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 107A of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (109 Stat. 522) is amended—

(1) by striking out "For fiscal year 1996, subject" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Subject";

(2) by striking out "of the total amount" and all that follows through "cost of inventory" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the amounts deposited in the account specified in subsection (b) from vending operations of the House of Representatives Restaurant System shall be available to pay the cost of goods sold"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) The account referred to in subsection (a) is the special deposit account established for the House of Representatives Restaurant by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k note)."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 102. (a) Section 3210(a)(6)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting "(or, in the case of a Member of the House, fewer than 90 days)" after "60 days"; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking out "60 days" and inserting in lieu thereof "90 days".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1996, and

shall apply with respect to any mailing post-marked on or after that date.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1997

For construction of platform and seating stands and for salaries and expenses of conducting the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States in January 1997, \$950,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and to remain available until September 30, 1997; *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for payment, on a direct or reimbursable basis, for such purposes whether incurred on, before, or after, October 1, 1996.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$777,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$5,470,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) \$867,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,225,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$68,392,000, of which \$32,927,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, and \$35,465,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including

motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$2,685,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1997 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 103. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Capitol Police Board for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES" upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES";

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate under the heading "SALARIES"; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of other transfers.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, \$1,991,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to employ more than forty individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$2,609,000.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not more than \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the

Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$24,288,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 104. (a) Any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease to the Congress subject to section 903 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (2 U.S.C. 111b).

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 105. (a) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 106. (a) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority to make lump-sum payments to separated employees of the Congressional Budget Office for unused annual leave.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, \$8,454,000.

TRAVEL

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

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

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

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not more than \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$23,255,000, of which \$2,950,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$5,020,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$32,556,000, of which \$4,825,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

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

Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$30,749,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1997.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$62,641,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$81,669,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1997".

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction

of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$2,902,000.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$215,007,000, of which not more than \$7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1997, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$33,402,000, of which not more than \$17,340,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1997 under 17 U.S.C. 708(d), and not more than \$4,929,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1997 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$22,269,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than \$2,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY

HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$44,964,000, of which \$11,694,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$4,882,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be

available, in an amount of not more than \$194,290, of which \$58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Librarian of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

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

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

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

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Librarian of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

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

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

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

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

SEC. 204. Of the amounts appropriated to the Librarian of Congress in this Act, not more than \$5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 205. Of the amount appropriated to the Librarian of Congress in this Act, not more than \$12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 206. (a) For fiscal year 1997, the obligational authority of the Librarian of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed \$108,275,000.

(b) The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Librarian in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

SEC. 207. (a)(1) Subject to subsection (b), for fiscal year 1997, the obligational authority of the Librarian of Congress for the activities described in paragraph (2) may not exceed \$2,000,000.

(2) The activities referred to in paragraph (1) are non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Librarian in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

(b) The obligational authority under subsection (a)—

(1) shall be available only with respect to Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, and Romania; and

(2) shall expire on December 31, 1996.

SEC. 208. (a) Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Librarian of Congress under the headings specified in subsection (b) may be transferred among such headings, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(b) The headings referred to in subsection (a) are as follows: (1) in title I, "CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE", "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; and (2) in this title, "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; "COPYRIGHT OFFICE"; "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; "BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED"; "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"; and "FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS".

SEC. 209. From and after October 1, 1996, the Disbursing Officer of the Librarian of Congress is authorized to disburse funds appropriated for the Office of Compliance, and the Librarian of Congress shall provide financial management support to the Office of Compliance as may be required and mutually agreed to by the Librarian of Congress and the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance. The Librarian of Congress is further authorized to compute and disburse the basic pay of all personnel of the Office of Compliance pursuant to the provisions of section 5504 of title 5.

All vouchers certified for payment by duly authorized certifying officers of the Librarian of Congress shall be supported with a certification by an officer or employee of the Office of Compliance duly authorized in writing by the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance to certify payments from appropriations of the Office of Compliance. The Office of Compliance certifying officers shall (1) be held responsible for the existence and correctness of the facts recited in the certificate or otherwise stated on the voucher or its supporting paper and the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved, (2) be held responsible and accountable for the correctness of the computations of certifications made, and (3) be held accountable for and required to make good to the United States the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate made by them, as well as for any payment prohibited by law which did not represent a legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States may, at his discretion, relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for any payment otherwise proper whenever he finds (1) that the certification was based on official records and that such certifying officer or employee did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained the actual facts, or (2) that the obligation was incurred in good faith, that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved, and the United States has received value for such payment: *Provided further*, That the Comptroller General shall relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for an overpayment for transportation services made to any common carrier covered by section 3726 of title 31, whenever he finds that the overpayment occurred solely because the administrative examination made prior to payment of the transportation bill did not include a verification of transportation rates, freight classifications, or land grant deductions.

The Disbursing Officer of the Librarian of Congress shall not be held accountable or responsible for any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate, the responsibility for which is imposed upon a certifying officer or employee of the Office of Compliance.

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

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and

operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$9,003,000, of which \$560,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$29,077,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$150,000: *Provided further*, That amounts of not more than \$2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for 1995 and 1996 to depository and other designated libraries.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING
FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than twelve passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,700 workyears: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not more than \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries

in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries; \$332,520,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than \$5,805,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 1997 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 303. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Mem-

bers, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

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

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

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

SEC. 306. During fiscal year 1997 and fiscal years thereafter, amounts appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol (including amounts relating to the Botanic Garden) may be transferred among accounts available to the Architect of the Capitol upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading "HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS";

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading "SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS"; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from any other appropriation.

SEC. 307. (a) Upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in accordance with conditions determined by the Committee on House Oversight, positions in connection with House public address sound system activities and related funding shall be transferred from the appropriation for the Architect of the Capitol for Capitol buildings and grounds under the heading "CAPITOL BUILDINGS" to the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives for the Office of the Clerk under the heading "SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES".

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

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

SEC. 308. (a) Effective October 1, 1996, the responsibility for maintenance of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds is transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police Board. Such maintenance shall be carried out under the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and

the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. On and after October 1, 1996, any alteration to a structural, mechanical, or architectural feature of the Capitol buildings and grounds that is required for security system maintenance under the preceding sentence may be carried out only with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

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

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1996, are—

(A) under the Architect of the Capitol;

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

(C) related to the maintenance of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

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

SEC. 309. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104-1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1997".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments shall be in order except amendments printed in House Report 104-663, which shall be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Pursuant to the previous orders of the House, amendment No. 6 by the gentlemen from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] may be considered in modified form; amendment No. 1 by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] may be considered at any time; and an amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] may be considered at any time as though printed in the report, and debatable for 10 minutes.

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 and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] whose amendment is printed in the report?

Mr. KLUG. I am, Mr. Chairman. The gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], unfortunately, was called back to her district offices because of a health problem with one of her staffers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 28, beginning on line 9, strike out "3,700 workyears" and insert in lieu thereof "3,600 workyears by the end of fiscal year 1997".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] opposed?

Mr. THORNTON. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today again on behalf of JENNIFER DUNN, who unfortunately had to be back in her district because of a health problem affecting one of her staffers, and also Chairman PAT ROBERTS.

Mr. Chairman, both Ms. DUNN, Chairman ROBERTS, and I believe that the Government Printing Office needs to continue to privatize and downsize.

Mr. Chairman, much of the debate over the last year has been about what level of government is capable of doing service the best, whether the Federal Government or the State government should run welfare, whether the State government or the Federal Government should run Medicaid, the health care program aimed at women and children.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, there is an additional question involved, which is to say what business is the Federal Government involved in today that we should not be involved in any longer whatsoever? I cannot think of a better example than the Government Printing Office, established essentially and maintained today in order to print Government documents that are needed on an emergency basis. Mr. Chairman, as soon as I find a Government document that needs to be printed on an emergency basis, I will be happy to share it with you and everybody else in the Chamber.

The fact of the matter is the Government Printing Office remains in business today for the most part to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Chairman, there are 115,000 private printers in the United States, and I think they are certainly capable of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight. If the Wall Street Journal can have a

story filed in Johannesburg, sent to New York where it is edited, sent up on a satellite dish in the Midwest, and it plops on my doorstep in Madison, WI, at 5:30 in the morning, assuredly somebody, one of the 115,000 private printers in the United States, can manage to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD overnight.

We continue to invest, I think foolishly, in printing equipment which is essentially out of date the minute it is put in place and into operation at the Government Printing Offices over on North Capitol Street.

This amendment today will reduce the full-time equivalent workyears by 100 which will save taxpayers about \$5 million. While that is a kind of a marginal savings on the outside, the bottom line is we continue to cut Government Printing Office staffing levels down from 4,500 where it was several years ago, below 4,000, now on the way to 3,500.

Let me make clear I know that our chairman's biggest fight in this entire battle is not necessarily in this House. We last year passed an amendment that passed by two-thirds. The fight will be in the conference committee. I think again we need to send a signal to the Senate that we want a Government Printing Office that essentially will contract out work and will procure work and serve as a clearinghouse for the Government but not to essentially be a Government printing press. Last year's amendment, as I said, received bipartisan support with a vote of 293 to 129.

The bottom line in all of this, and one more point, Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, in 1991 the GPO lost over \$1 million, in 1992 it lost almost \$5.5 million, in 1993 it lost \$14 million, in 1994 it lost \$21 million, in 1995 its loss was \$3 million, and the fiscal year 1996 loss to date is \$13 million. Every place you look, the Government Printing Office loses money because the Government should not be in the business of running printing presses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it would be of interest to the Congress to note that in this bill, we have provided funds for a study that would help to determine whether the GPO would be better off contracting out or privatizing the printing of the daily journal. So we are moving in the same direction, I believe, that the offeror of the amendment would like us to go.

It is true that the Government Printing Office has lost money, about \$60 million over the last 6 years, that the inplant work load has declined by about 17 percent, and that the printing procurement work load has declined by about the same, 17 percent, and that it is realistic to assume that we can reduce the work force further in GPO. Therefore, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The GPO has already had a series of cuts, leading to 3,700 employees at this time. Much of the work of the GPO is already contracted out. The efficiencies and effectiveness which were designed to be brought into the Government Printing Office have been successful and are on a right track. GPO should be allowed to continue on this track into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a continuing effort to, I think, precipitously reduce the FTE'S at GPO. Very frankly, it is my feeling that, until it is reduced to zero, that the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentlewoman from Washington State will continue to offer amendments to reduce it. I understand that. That may not be completely accurate, but that is my sense.

This reduces an additional 100 FTE's. This amendment, in my opinion, does not take into account the hard work that continues to occur at the GPO to downsize its work force. I think they have gotten the message—in a manner, however, that is consistent with the requirements placed on it by Congress. That is the key. Consistent with the requirements placed on it, not by some third party, but by Congress itself.

There is a point, Mr. Chairman, when the essential demands of the House and the Senate to put a RECORD of word-for-word proceedings on the desk of each Representative and Senator the next morning and, frankly, at the request of every citizen in our country, to print the Federal Register in a timely fashion, to print bills for committees and subcommittees, there is a point when this kind of reduction in personnel will cause the GPO to become unable to react satisfactorily.

Since 1993, the GPO has reduced its work force by over 1,000 persons. This is not an agency that is growing or is bloated. It is an agency that has been reduced, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] have reduced it further by an additional 50 in this bill.

The Committee on Appropriations in this bill has already adopted, as I say, the reductions after examining the process carefully; and the GPO management has a program to continue downsizing its work force in a managed framework.

I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], because I have been at some of his hearings, is keenly aware of the questions arising by GPO's activities and is looking at it very closely.

I submit that this additional FTE cut will make the process of downsizing

even more difficult for the GPO and should not be adopted.

This amendment attempts to micro-manage the Government Printing Office by an arbitrary reduction of its work force. That is no way to run a very successful printing operation on which the Congress depends heavily and on which the American public depends.

I would urge that this amendment be defeated, Mr. Chairman, and for the House to permit GPO to continue its orderly program of downsizing.

Why is that important? It is important, first of all, because we have people that we have asked to perform duties for the Congress and for the American public.

If management is given a figure to reduce to, they can effect that if you give them sufficient time to let attrition and a change in the undertakings, the responsibilities of that agency, to occur. If, however, you do it precipitously, there is no alternative but to RIF people. As everybody knows, a reduction in force under the Federal work rules is a very costly endeavor indeed, which is why even in the private sector they try to avoid that if at all possible.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the House would support the action of the committee which has already reduced based upon its judgment of what can be done within the time frame available in the fiscal year 1997 budget. I commend the committee for its actions, and I would hope that they would be sustained by the House.

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dunn amendment which would reduce the Government Printing Office by 100 full-time employees.

Some Members may say, what is the big deal about reducing 100 full-time employees from this office. If you take into consideration that in 1976 there were 8,000 employees at the GPO and presently there are 3,800 employees at the GPO, that becomes a big deal. One thousand of these cuts have occurred since 1993. These reductions were accomplished through attrition and improved computer technology. The GPO has managed the transition to electronic technologies and downsized without interrupting services to the Congress, other Federal agencies and, most importantly, to the public. They have done an excellent job.

As computer technology changes the way the Federal Government does its business, we should be sensitive to reducing the work force, the people, which produce government documents. The futurist, John Nesbitt, in his book "Megatrends" wrote that as society be-

comes more high tech, it should remain high touch. I believe that can be interpreted to mean that as a computer society becomes bigger and more important in our lives, we should not let this advancement influence the way we treat our fellow human beings.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be high tech, but it sure is not high touch. Vote against the Dunn amendment, please.

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

Let me just respond briefly to the gentleman from North Carolina, in talking about concerns and feelings and a sense of having empathy. My empathy goes out to the taxpayers of America who continue to fund an organization that I think largely is out of date and I think the gentleman from North Carolina brings up a very good point. With the increasing use of the Internet, the Government is less reliant on paper than ever before. CD roms can now replace entire volumes of hard-bound documents.

The point is in the current environment we are going into, it does not call for a continual support of the GPO. It essentially says that GPO has an even tougher job in the future justifying their existence, period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

□ 1330

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

In the recent past I was the ranking Republican member serving on the House-Senate Joint Committee on Printing. That is the congressional entity with oversight of the GPO's operation. I have been over there many times and talked with many employees and many of the administrative folks down there as well. I think the basic problem here is the financial loss. In 1991, as has been stated in the debate, when the GPO lost \$1.2 million, 1992 losses began to increase to \$5.2 million; in 1994, losses topped out at \$21.8 million. Even during this fiscal year, the GPO has already lost \$13 million. Only the Federal Government, it seems to me, would continue to run an agency at a total loss to the taxpayer. There is a lot of red ink down there, we have to fix it.

The first question that comes to mind is, where does all the money go in regard to the GPO? Every study that we have had in regard to this operation says about 80 percent of all the GPO costs are dedicated to personnel costs.

Now, the second question that comes to mind is this: Why is so much money being lost? Well, I do not think we can blame the employees. That is not the intent. They are doing their jobs and they are doing them well, for that matter. Rather, it is the advanced technology that has been discussed on the floor in this regard and the move toward something called electronic print-

ing that has changed the way that the GPO does business.

The entire Government is using less paper and shifting to on-line services to gather and disperse information. The traditional customers of the GPO are simply turning to these alternatives to get their information much more quickly and in a cost-efficient manner. This amendment simply reflects the future of government as dictated by technology and as demanded by taxpayers. That is what the amendment is about. With this trend continuing toward less paper and more reliance on web sites and CD-ROM's, we will need fewer people to produce the government documents.

I have said many times in the last few years, at many hearings, the world is changing and the GPO must change as well. While I recognize and appreciate the efforts of the GPO, I believe we must continue to guide the GPO down the path to a smaller, more efficient Government. We have a responsibility to the taxpayer to reduce costs, just as all of the printing businesses on America's Main Streets do in the same situation.

I would point out that last year this amendment or a very similar amendment received bipartisan support and the vote was 293-129. It reduced the FTE's by 350. That was down from 3,900 to 3,550. Then 250 FTE's were restored in conference. I believe the final conference version simply brought the FTE count to 3,800.

So, first we achieved the reform, and then it is taken away in conference. First we make the cuts, which are reasonable cuts, by a vote of 293 to 129. Then 250 are restored in conference. So we really did not even do what the House voted for in the last session of Congress. This has nothing to do about employees, nothing to do about the good work at the GPO. It is advanced technology and the way the Government does its job in regard to that technology.

So I am very happy to cosponsor the amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN] and also my colleague from Wisconsin. I urge its support.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we have a level of about 3,700 people in the Government Printing Office now. That is less than 50 percent of what it used to be. We used to have about 8,000 people in the Government Printing Office, and they had a reputation for doing a very good job. They still have a reputation for doing an excellent, professional job. If we talk to people in the private sector, the Printing Industries of America, whatever, they will say that they have a high level of respect for people in the Government Printing Office.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], our friend, said this is not about people, this is not about those employees. Well, the fact is, it is.

We are cutting another 100 people that are doing their job, have consistently done everything that the Congress has asked them to, have been subject to continuing downsizing. They accept the downsizing. They are on a glide path. They are reducing the number of people that work there, not as fast as they are reducing their workload.

The only thing that makes sense is that this is some kind of vendetta against the Government Printing Office and it does not make sense. We were reducing them. Let us do it in the way that we previously agreed to. Reject this amendment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arkansas, a member of the committee, has the right to close.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], showing the bipartisan opposition to this amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It does indicate that there is bipartisan opposition, because opposition to this amendment is to really assist this Congress and the people of the United States.

This amendment that I oppose and many others oppose would arbitrarily reduce the Government Printing Office by 100 additional full-time employees. These are people who have worked for many years for the Government Printing Office for us. The legislative branch appropriation bill, it already reduces the Government Printing Office by 100 full-time employees, reducing its staff from 3,800 FTE's to 3,700 FTE's.

Twenty years ago, GPO had a staff of 8,000. Today it is less than half that amount. More than half of these cuts have occurred since 1993. The Government Printing Office has been able to accomplish these reductions by careful management, attrition and by updating their computer systems. An additional cut of 100 employees would disrupt the GPO's work. Between 75 and 80 percent of GPO's work is already being sent to outside bidders, and we know that GPO gets the best price around. The remaining work done in-house is often sent by the Congress to be done on a moment's notice and they do it.

This amendment would arbitrarily disrupt both the productivity of the Government Printing Office and the lives of its personnel. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Dunn amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few brief points in closing because we are just about out of time on both sides. I simply want to make the point that, more so than anything else, if we are going to be interested in some-

body's interest in this debate that is going on, the interest should be that of the American taxpayers. The General Accounting Office, which is the investigative arm of Congress, when it has done investigations in the past on the Government Printing Office, essentially says, whenever we print a document there, it costs 2½ times what it does in the private sector.

In response to the point earlier of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], I do not want to see the Government Printing Office be eliminated, but I think it should largely become a procurement arm of the government and get out of the printing industry itself.

Over the last 5 years, as we have pointed out, the Government Printing Office has lost \$57 million. The gentleman on the other side are correct that the Government Printing Office does what Congress asks it to do. What we are trying to say on this side of the aisle is we have asked it to do so many things. We should ask it to do less, and we should ask it to do with fewer people than we see at the present time.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee has carefully reviewed this and has determined that the reductions, which are significant, which have been recommended by the committee, are appropriate and that the functioning of the GPO, which, among other things, has the responsibility of transferring authority to the electronic media, can be well carried out within the committee recommendation.

I believe that the adoption of the amendment will impair that function, and I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 104-663.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] wish to offer his amendment?

If not, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: Page 31, after line 2, insert the following:

The aggregate amount otherwise provided under this heading is hereby reduced by \$250,000, and the amount of such reduction shall be retained in the Treasury for purposes of deficit reduction and shall not be available for appropriation for any other purpose for fiscal year 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for two purposes. One is to show my dissatisfaction with the operations of the GAO, and especially for some of the studies that have come forth that I have been cognizant of, that I find less than professional. I wish to serve notice on the GAO that I believe they can do the job a lot better, and I feel more objective, than what I have seen in the past.

I acknowledge that the committee has already cut GAO by a significant figure and, therefore, my amendment really is not meaningful. But this amendment was drafted over a month ago in preparation. I told my staff that I wanted to be able to take this opportunity to suggest that the GAO can do a better job.

But the second purpose of me being here is to talk about the appropriation bill that is now before us.

Back last year during the Government shutdown, when Speaker GINGRICH decided that the Government should shut down in order to persuade the President to sign a balanced budget that they wanted, and other bills that they wanted, we had Federal employees, many of which are in my district, who did not know whether they were going to be able to work, did not know whether they were going to be paid if they did work. And many of them were very hurt by the actions of this Congress.

I had one lady who worked for a Federal agency who called me up, and she has children. She got a paycheck for 2 weeks' work that was around \$5. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, every employee of the legislative branch, GAO, committee staff, my staff, everybody else was feeling great. They were getting paid right along because their appropriation bill had been signed in October.

Well, I called my friend over at the White House, not the President but somebody else, and talked to him at that time about it. I said, next year we will probably be ending up at the same place, and it looks to me like we are going there. When I look at the Interior bill, I look at the HUD and Independent Agencies bill, I look at Labor, HHS and Education bill, going down the same road, dead end, not going to get done.

I am not the only one that says that. Their own leader, the gentleman from Texas, is saying it. He is saying we are not going to get it done, we have got to have a continuing resolution until March to get by this. Well, my position is, and I think I would like to find out from the gentleman from California, who I consider a good friend. Ever since we have been here, we have worked together on things.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill should be the very last bill that gets signed by the President. If other Federal agencies, employees of this Federal Government are not going to know whether they are going to get paychecks or not, are not going to know whether they are going to be able to work or not at their jobs, I do not believe that my employees, that any committee staff, GAO, Library of Congress, police force, you name it, they should have the same problem.

My position is, if all that happens, maybe we will actually get it done, rather than having your own staff gripe at Members and saying, well, I do not have money for dinner, because those people out there, a lot of them did not have money for dinner. They might come along and ask: Can I come over to your house for dinner? I need something to eat, if it is on your own committee or your own personal staff.

So my suggestion is let us go slow on this bill. If we want to finish up here today and have the Senate take it up later when Members take it to conference, just do not come out of conference until everything else is done. Then, when all the other bills are out of the way and we know that the Government will not shut down again, because last time it was shut down because somebody in this House, the Speaker and a few other people on that side, decided they wanted to shut it down. They were going to teach the President a lesson. Well, that same thing could happen. Very easily, somebody does not get their way on that side, they decide, well, let us shut the Government down again.

If it does, why should our employees have the comfort, and that is what it is, a comfort of knowing that they are going to be able to go to work the next day. They are going to get their paycheck at the end of the month when all these other Federal employees do not have any idea at all about it.

□ 1345

We know what happened last year in that Government shutdown was terrible. I still have people in my district who went through that at the Veterans Hospital, at research centers and others, that still talk to me about it. They still do not know. There is no certainty to them. They are wondering right now whether they are going to be paid and they are going to be working or there is going to be another Government shutdown.

Well, if we want to try to ensure that there will not, let us say no. If there is going to be a shutdown, we shut down too.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from California. I want to know his position on that.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment has very little to do with what he has expressed.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that that is correct.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to take it out on the GAO as a means of trying to convey the gentleman's concerns for whether we shut the Government down again or not is probably not the appropriate thing to do.

I certainly am not, and this subcommittee is not, going to be making the decision as to whether we shut down or not.

Mr. VOLKMER. I agree with that.

Mr. PACKARD. My personal observation is that there is bipartisan agreement that shutting down the Government is not a good procedure, and I think we will use every effort to avoid that, and I assume we will avoid that.

I think, speaking directly to the gentleman's amendment, I have some real concerns because we have cut the GAO over the last year's bill and this year's bill to 25 percent of the dollar cut from the previous year, and a 37 percent cut in the staff. \$250,000 is no significant amount of money in their large budget, but the fact is it would be a slap in the face for them, I think, after we have made an agreement that we would not ask them to sustain more than the 25-percent cut. They would have liked to have sustained less than the 25-percent cut this year, but they agreed to keep their word, and I would have a very red face to go back to them and say \$250,000 we will cut further.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman has time to do all that, but I am trying to get an answer to a simple question and I have not got it yet.

Does the gentleman think that his should be the last bill to go until all the other bills are done or should he go ahead so all his workers and his committee staff, they get the comfort of knowing they are going to get paid while they go ahead and shut down the Government on the other people?

Mr. PACKARD. The President has the option to veto this bill. I think we should sent it to the President as quickly as we can.

Mr. VOLKMER. In other words, the gentleman believes that it is all right to tell other people in the Federal Government, others that they can be shut down, they do not get paid, but he is going to take care of his.

Mr. PACKARD. I think our job as appropriators is to appropriate the funds necessary to run Government, and that is what we are doing in my bill and that is what we are doing in the other bills. Certainly I am not suggesting that we shut the Government down.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is obvious to me that the gentleman from California is willing to shut down the Government on other people, like he did, and the gentleman participated in that. I can show him the votes where he agreed to shut down the Government and let it be shut down, and those people did not get paid for a long time. They went weeks without pay and then, at the

same time, he had the comfort of knowing that this committee staff, sitting around him now, his personal staff, they all got their paychecks and everything else. That was comfort.

All I am saying is if there is going to be sacrifice, I think we should start with the sacrifice. I do not think that we should consider our people and the people that work for this legislative branch better than other Federal agencies. That is why I am asking the gentleman to hold off on this bill and not do it until every other appropriation bill for all Federal agencies are done.

If there is going to be a shutdown, and I think there is a possibility there will, then the gentleman should let his legislative staff and my legislative staff have to suffer also.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

It really is punitive to the GAO and the message and the signal that the gentleman wishes to convey to our leadership on both sides and the President as to whether we shut the Government down is totally extraneous to this issue. I would really invite the gentleman to withdraw his amendment because we have cut the GAO far more than I think he ever would have had he been chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is the forum in which we debate the whole issue of whether we shut the Government down again or not. I do not anticipate that debate coming for several weeks or maybe several months, but the point is that will not be made by this bill.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to say it is obvious to me, because of what I have said before in my statement, that we are headed for a shutdown as far as certain agencies are concerned. Unless that side makes some changes, that shutdown will occur. And if it does occur the way the gentleman wants it to, there will be agencies out there that will not get paid while our people are paid.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There is no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PACKARD

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, I offer the Packard amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACKARD: On page 32, at the end of line 17, add the following: (c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person

intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or sub-contract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell Members that this is the Traficant language regarding "Buy America." I have no problem with the amendment and will accept it.

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

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

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I want to thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], for the great job he has done.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's consideration and the committee staff who helped with this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

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

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the committee for its work in promoting the Books for the Blind Program. The Books for the Blind Program is funded through the Library of Congress and ensures that our blind and visually impaired populations will have continued access to printed reading materials.

This past week I had the pleasure of addressing the national convention of the National Federation of the Blind, an organization representing those members of our society who must rely

almost exclusively on the Books for the Blind Program for reading materials of all kinds, whether educational, informational, or for the latest best seller. I therefore wish to commend my colleagues on the committee for increasing funding for this worthy program to nearly \$45 million.

Due to the tremendous role this program plays in the lives of our blind and visually impaired fellow citizens, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California what effect, if any, would section 208 of the measure have on the Books for the Blind Program.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would be happy to speak to the gentleman's point.

Section 208 allows the Library of Congress to request that funds from the five-line-item appropriations funding the Library of Congress be shifted to meet its needs. The Books for the Blind Program is one of these five line items, but of course this committee has not legislatively decreased these funds for the blind. In fact, we increased funds in this year's bill.

As the gentleman pointed out, this program is the primary source of reading material for the blind, and the committee has been pleased to increase funds for this service in the bill that we are debating today. Under section 208 the Librarian could request, for instance, that funds be added to the Books for the Blind account and taken from the other four line items.

It is most unlikely, though possible, that the Librarian could request funds to be shifted out of this account; however, even were the Librarian to make such a request, it would have to be approved by the House and Senate appropriations committees before any transfer could take place. I personally have to approve that, and of course we have been very protective of the Books for the Blind. So section 208 provides a mechanism by which the efficiency of the Library of Congress and the Books for the Blind program can be maximized.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I applaud his efforts in ensuring that the Books for the Blind Program continues to provide services so desperately needed by the Nation's blind and visually impaired citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Page 35, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 310. Any amount appropriated in this Act for "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Represent-

tational Allowances" shall be available only for fiscal year 1997. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished cosponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and that he be allowed to control that 5 minutes of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, pending the arrival of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] on the floor, I might stand in his stead for the 5 minutes. When he arrives I will be pleased to yield that time to him.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many Members of this body who come to Congress come with the goal of saving taxpayers money, being frugal with their own office spending accounts as is possible. Since entering Congress, many of us try to save for the taxpayers and keep our office expenses to a minimum.

Over the last 3 years in our Michigan's 7th District office, we have saved \$636,000. After my first year of cost cutting and making the effort to be conscious of spending, I was appalled and disturbed that a Member's savings did not save money; that the money would go automatically into other accounts and add to those accounts to expand spending.

In my first year in Congress, like many first-year Members, we were striving to make sure that we do not buy more than what is needed in stationery, that we do not waste the money by overspending on computers or any other items only to find out that someone else spent the money that was saved. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, like the amendment that we put in last year, for the first time allows the savings to go to the Department of the Treasury for deficit reduction.

This amendment is identical to the amendment that we passed last year, and I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment. Last year this amendment was passed by a vote of 423 to 21 margin as an amendment to the legislative appropriation bills to return these unspent funds to the Department of the Treasury. If we do not have some consideration, some incentive for Members to be careful on how they spend taxpayers' money, then we are not as apt to do it.

So I say let us pass this amendment, let us notify each office of how much they have under spent, how much they have saved taxpayers, and let us make sure with this amendment that that money will be going toward deficit reduction rather than simply into another account.

□ 1400

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was accepted last year and I would certainly be anxious to accept it this year. It expresses the very intent of our bill, and that is to return these funds to the Treasury.

It is the intent of the committee bill. It is the desire of the chairman and, I believe, the ranking member, that this be done. I do not think there is any opposition from any member of the subcommittee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be accepted and that we can move on to the following.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and do so for the following reasons. Mr. Chairman, as we look out across America and we see people working so hard, sometimes both people in the family are working to support their children. Sometimes small businesses are making very, very tough decisions to stay in a mode where they are growing and maybe just making it through that year. We here in the House of Representatives need to make decisions to help balance the budget and move toward a balanced budget sooner rather than later.

Now, if balancing the budget starts at home, it certainly should start in the House of Representatives here with our own accounts.

What this amendment simply does, it simply says that when you make some of those tough choices and those tough decisions in your own office to save money, do not let money be respent and go toward somebody else's office where they are spending more money on their office or on mail.

Last year we were able to pass this amendment 403 to 21. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and myself and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] and a host of other people, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], helped pass this amendment and say for the first time that when you are fiscally responsible as a Member of Congress, you are going to contribute to deficit reduction and not contribute to somebody else's office funds where they are spending too much of those funds on mail or staff or some other thing.

Let me say too, Mr. Chairman, that this language is identical to my bill,

which is H.R. 26. I have 126 cosponsors on this legislation, both Republicans and Democrats, working together to find new innovative ways to help balance the budget and reduce the deficit that Congress and the Presidents have created over the past 20 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an innovative approach. It certainly is an approach where we say balancing the budget must start inside the Beltway. It must cut Washington, DC, spending first. It must say that it starts in the home, which is the House of Representatives. And it says, I think in a bipartisan way, the support of bipartisanship that so many people in this country want to see that, we have come up with a new idea, a new way to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to be an original sponsor and the sponsor of the bill H.R. 26. I am very, very happy to work with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and others.

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

Mr. ROEMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his leadership in this bipartisan effort and would like to state that certainly the amendment is acceptable to the minority. As the chairman has stated, it is acceptable to the majority. I hope that we will be able to get a good vote on this for the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a giant step in the way we are changing business in the United States Congress. Maybe it could be akin to the baby step forward. But still, if every Member of Congress knows how much they are spending for the carts, for the computers, for everything they buy in that office, and we start running our offices like a business, it will help save taxpayer dollars.

Last year, for the first time in history, we had made a decision in this Congress to return this money to Treasury to go toward deficit reduction. That is our goal. Balancing the budget needs to be ever on our minds as we strive to make sure that our economy and jobs expand. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just say in concluding my remarks, because we were hopeful that a number of the cosponsors such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. KLUG], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] might show up to speak, but I know a number of Members have commitments and hearings and markups and so forth.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, the strong vote last time by the House, by the entire body here who controls how we spend our money and how we save our money, 403 to 21; 403 Democrats and Republicans coming up with a new idea, saying to this body and to taxpayers across the country, we will save money in our office accounts, tighten our own belts and contribute that money to reducing the deficit. That is a positive step forward, I think.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan intends to call for a rollcall vote. Certainly, with the bipartisan support from the Republican and Democratic sides, I will not call for a vote, especially in light of the strong vote that we had last time, but I would continue to urge Members to support this measure when they are talking to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], and that we may also look next year at including the leadership funds into this package of savings as well, so that everybody across the board contributes to deficit reduction.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and I have both offered freestanding bills on this. I hope we can move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and I want to commend my colleague from Indiana for working on this matter for a number of years, and I appreciate my colleague from Michigan's support on this as well. I think this is a positive amendment and I would urge my colleagues to vote for it. This would allow Members to return unspent office funds to the Treasury. It would allow them to use those funds returned for specifically deficit reduction and I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the 104th Congress has led a historic effort to reduce the deficit and incorporate fiscal responsibility into Federal spending.

Today, we again have the opportunity to lead by example. This amendment would allow Members to return unspent office funds to the U.S. Treasury for the specific purpose of deficit reduction. It would reaffirm our commitment to eliminating the Federal debt.

It is important that fiscal responsibility start at home. Since being elected to Congress in 1991, I have not spent over \$565,000 of my office funds. Like most Americans, I have spent wisely and made do with what I had.

Naysayers claim that money can't be returned to the U.S. Treasury. Many Members, however, save taxpayer money by spending

less. These Members should be recognized for their efforts and taxpayers should be rewarded by allowing them to use unspent funds to reduce the deficit.

We should not abandon this effort because it requires some changes. This Congress has changed many things, and if need be, we can change to allow Members to contribute savings to deficit reduction.

By adopting this amendment we reaffirm our commitment to deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill, there is \$363 million appropriated for legislative representative office expenses. Let us make a commitment today, now, that we are going to manage and safeguard those funds to the greatest extent of our managerial ability to make sure that taxpayers get their money's worth from the operations of our individual offices.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 104-664.

AMENDMENT NO. 6, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY
MR. CAMPBELL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment No. 6, as modified, offered by Mr. CAMPBELL: Before the short title at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 312. (a) In addition to any other estimates the Director is required to make pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the ranking minority member of that committee), prepare an estimate for any major spending legislation, as designated by the majority leader of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the minority leader of the House), of the change in spending and revenues resulting from the legislation on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of such legislation, and shall include a statement identifying those assumptions. Such estimates shall be submitted to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget and of the committees of subject-matter jurisdiction, and, if timely submitted, shall be included in the reports on such legislation.

(b) In addition to any other estimates the Chief of Staff is required to make pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation shall, upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives (after consultation

with the ranking minority member of that committee), prepare an analysis of any major tax legislation, as designated by the majority of the House of Representatives (after consultation with the minority leader of the House), of the change in spending and revenues resulting from that legislation on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of such legislation, and shall include a statement identifying those assumptions. Such analyses shall be submitted to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the committees of subject-matter jurisdiction, and if timely submitted, shall be included in the reports on such legislation.

(c) Estimates and analyses made pursuant to this section are to be used for informational purposes only.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House resolution 473, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] oppose the amendment?

Mr. SABO. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The amendment that I offer would permit an additional form of understanding and analysis of the economic effect of legislation that we pass here.

I begin by emphasizing the amendment does not replace any existing method at all. But in addition to existing methods, occasionally it is appropriate to consider what is called a dynamic economic model, and this has application on the tax side as well as on the expenditure side. Most of the literature in the academic world of economics has dealt with the dynamic effects on taxes or tax cuts, but I have been careful in this amendment to specify that this additional method shall apply to the dynamic effect of expenditures as well.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important that we have that kind of information available. This amendment allows that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget can request CBO, in addition to all the other means of analysis of a fiscal spending bill, to perform a dynamic economic analysis as well; the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, similarly, in addition to all other forms of economic analysis, can request dynamic economic modeling on tax bills as well.

In each case the Chair is required to consult with the ranking minority member. I would point out that this methodology is used already in several of the United States, specifically I know of the one in my own State of California. That it is actually a more difficult process for a State because the leakage, if you will, from a State economy is a greater problem to estimate than the leakage from the U.S.

economy. And yet dynamic economic modeling is being practiced and offering value in the analysis of the States of Massachusetts and California.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my opening remarks by observing that this amendment to the bill will provide additional information and does not supplant any other existing information. I cannot see how it would do anything but help our analysis and the job that we do on behalf of the citizens we represent. And I note in conclusion that the academic-economic research institutes that are engaged in this process so far include the National Bureau of Economic Research, which has offices at Harvard University and Stanford University, UCLA; the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Michigan.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This amendment does authorize the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use the dynamic scoring model on spending and tax legislation for informational purposes only.

This is an issue that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget and the Joint Committee on Taxation, and I understand that it has been approved and has received agreement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation. And with that approval, I have no objections and would be more than pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, first let me commend the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for the extremely diligent and hard work that he has done in bringing this amendment to the floor. I think it is of great importance, and I guess from the Joint Economic Committee point of view, the best I think to say is very simply that we talk about growth policy in taxes, and we talk about the negative aspects or the negative effects of high taxes, and I think on both sides of the aisle we share the belief that there is a stimulus that can be gained if we are smart about tax policy. And we also recognize, I think on both sides of the aisle, that bad tax policy can work as a wet blanket on the economy, a wet blanket on our revenue. And yet the rules that we operate under deny any of that takes place.

And so, the gentleman's amendment gives the chairman of the committee the opportunity, the choice to make as to whether or not they want to treat a particular item of tax policy and score it and figure out what is going to happen in terms of our revenue from a dynamic model, meaning that we accept the fact that there will be some changes positive or negative, and that that can be factored into the equation.

One of the things that happens around here to all of us in Congress is that people do not think that we know what we are doing. And I think sometimes that happens with good cause. If we, on the one hand, say that we are going to pass a certain tax because we want to make the economy grow and hence enhance our revenue stream, and yet our rules tell us that that cannot happen and we cannot consider those facts, then, in fact, the public is certainly entitled to think we do not know what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I was fishing the other day in the rain. This is a story that goes along with this static model, I think. I was fishing in the rain the other day and I got off the boat after having a wonderful day fishing and the skipper said, How did you like it? I said, it was wonderful, we caught fish, the company was good, but the only thing is my glasses kept fogging up because it was raining. And he said, You should be used to that; you are from Washington.

And this static rule is one of the things around here that perpetuates the knowledge, the belief among the American public, that we do not know what we are doing and that our glasses are, in fact, foggy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from California will go a long way, in my view, toward unfogging our glasses and letting us know ahead of time what it is that our policy will produce.

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

□ 1415

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bizarre amendment in some ways yields incredible powers to the majority leader. Second, I would remind Members who eventually decides how things are scored here is the Committee on the Budget. CBO is advisory. This provides the option for the Committee on the Budget to use new, crazy, funny numbers to score a variety of proposals, either on the tax or the spending side. Lots of folks I have heard on my side of the aisle over the years come with proposals on the spending side that say, if we do this, this will save all this money in outyears. We have not followed that.

Mr. Chairman, this is another of those sort of ideological proposals. Part of it has had hearings. The hearings that relate to the tax side were held in January of 1995. There have not

been any hearings on the spending side of this proposal. But those hearings were overwhelmingly against moving to this type of dynamic scoring.

Let us be clear, the current system is not pure static. Members do look at the impact of legislation. But let me read what Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan had to say before the Committee on the Budget of Congress on January 10, 1995, and I know my friend from California was not here then. Let me quote:

Can we effectively create an econometric model which fully captures all the effects of a specific policy action? I would say to you, not in our lifetime.

Let me continue with another one:

We should be especially cautious about adopting technical scoring procedures that might be susceptible to overly optimistic assessments.

Third quote:

Should financial markets lose confidence in the integrity of our budget scoring procedures, the rise in inflation premiums and interest rates could more than offset any statistical difference between so-called static and more dynamic scoring.

This is an amendment that should not be adopted.

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

It may be that my good friend and colleague has been referring to an earlier version of the bill because the majority leader is not in this bill at all. So the gentleman's opening comment worrying about the delegation of authority to the majority leader is not in this bill or in this amendment.

Let me repeat what the amendment does. It supplements, it never replaces. And regarding Alan Greenspan's testimony, what he was saying is absolutely right. Never in our lifetime will we know everything. But as a supplement to what we now do as opposed to a replacement for it, I do not believe he was speaking against this proposal.

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

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

Let me apologize. The version of the amendment that I saw had majority leader. Let me also indicate to the gentleman that it is the Committee on the Budget that eventually scores budgets and that adopts assumptions around here. This provides a mechanism for them to use this new untested and unproven method for purposes of both budgets and scoring bills.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I participated in hearings on the concept of dynamic scoring and acknowledge to the amendment's sponsor that, as a hypothetical matter, the dynamic impact of public policy decisions made by Congress in the spending and tax areas certainly has legitimacy. In fact, presently the CBO does con-

template changes in resulting behavior.

If my colleagues look at, for example, the varying CBO estimates on health policy expenditures, they see that there is a small element of dynamic scoring presently at play in CBO assumptions. The larger question though is, Does the methodology exist that allows dynamic scoring to proceed with a degree of legitimacy that would play in public policy debate?

On this exact question I put to Mr. Greenspan when he was before us, my question from the transcript: Reading your testimony, it seems to me to indicate, while there may be a conceptual legitimacy to concepts of a more dynamic approach in scoring, we simply do not have the tools, the ability at the present time to reasonably quantify in a way that would give anyone the certainty required under this deficit picture that we should move toward a more dynamic process; is that correct?

Mr. Greenspan's response: On the broader question of can we effectively create an economic model which fully captures all the effects of a specific policy action, I would say to you, not in our lifetime.

Now, what is so important here is that, literally, these dynamic assumptions, we would be asking Congress literally to bet the ranch on their legitimacy. Both parties have members that say, we cut taxes, we are going to make more money, or we increase spending and we will actually reduce government outlays. Of course, those very concepts are antithetical. Yet, on the other hand, using a dynamic scoring model, we may have some very erroneous partisan-driven assumptions placed on a dynamic model, and it would, I think, jeopardize seriously the budget debates of this Congress.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment as a member of the Committee on the Budget. In some of the debates we have already heard today, it needs to be pointed out to the House we already have dynamic scoring. That is already, when it is supportable it is used. That is the way it ought to be. The idea that CBO uses only static scoring is erroneous. If dynamic scoring is a good thing, it should be a good thing in all instances, not just when the Committee on the Budget chairman finds that it will serve his purpose to use it in consultation with the ranking minority.

Saying that the dynamic scoring is only informational ignores the fact that all CBO scoring is informational. It is the Committee on the Budget which ultimately decides which assumptions to use. And therein I want to close by again repeating the words that we should heed, those words of Alan Greenspan, when he testified earlier this year in the Committee on the

Budget. He stated, clearly, our political process has a bias to words deficit spending, a bias toward deficit spending. Accordingly, we should be especially cautious about adopting technical scoring procedures that might, might be susceptible to overly optimistic assessments of the budgetary consequences of fiscal actions. We must avoid resting key legislative decisions on controversial estimates of revenue and outlays. Should financial markets lose confidence in the integrity of our budget scoring procedure, the rise in inflation premiums and interest rates could more than offset any statistical difference between so-called static and more dynamic scoring.

We should oppose this amendment today. It does not serve a helpful purpose. At a time in which we clearly are needy, have got the deficit heading in the right direction. This is not a time to be experimenting with somebody's philosophical beliefs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, is it the case that because we cannot know everything, which was the burden of Alan Greenspan's comment, we must, therefore, know nothing? This is a very sound amendment. It would permit us some additional information only. Are we so frightened of information that we do not wish to know it?

Right now under our current arrangements, the Congressional Budget Office makes macroeconomic estimates of gross domestic product, unemployment, interest rates. And then the Joint Committee on Taxation, when it takes a look at our revenue legislation, finds that these things are fixed and immutable like the old stars in an Aristotelian firmament. Nothing that we do with revenues can affect unemployment. Nothing that we do with tax legislation can affect interest rates or gross domestic product. Those things are fixed.

Yes, we can take behavior into account, but only within this box that is already fixed in advance by CBO. We know this does not work. We know it produces false results.

When I was on the Committee on the Budget, I had a chance to ask the director of CBO, Robert Reischauer why it was that on average CBO's estimate of the deficit were in error by over 100 percent. That kind of estimating error would get you fired anywhere in the private sector. His answer was, we are not as far off as OMB, as the White House budget estimators. There is no way in the world that anyone can say that what presently we do makes sense or appreciates reality.

When we increased the rate of tax on capital gains by 40 percent in 1986, revenues to the Treasury dropped by a third. But CBO, using this model, and joint tax, using this model, told us that revenues were going to go up but we increased that stated rate.

We have a lot of real world evidence that tells us that the flat earth econo-

metric model, if we can call it an econometric model, simply does not work as in use around here.

So what my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], is telling us is, let us experiment, yes, by looking at this for informational purposes only. We will not use it. It will not supplant our current scoring system, but we can have the information. If Members want to bury their heads in the sand and follow flat earth economics forever into the future, vote no. But if they want an honest evaluation and new information, vote yes on this very sound amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from my friend, the gentleman from California. We have heard the technical reasons why to oppose this amendment. We have heard Dr. Greenspan quoted.

I recall the Committee on the Budget, Joint Committee on the Budget hearing we held early in the session with House and Senate Members. The conclusion broadly from every economist was that to the extent that we need dynamic scoring, they already can do it. But to suggest additional rosy scenarios be injected into it was a huge mistake.

Before we make this mistake again, let us just look back at the historical record. This amendment says that CBO should consider other impacts which would increase revenue projections, dynamic scoring of revenue provisions, beyond just the revenue coming in and so on.

Let us look at the record of CBO over the last 15 years. Look, every line above this median is a year in which the CBO underestimated the deficit. About half of each of these underestimates are they assumed that we would spend less than we actually did, but the other half is they assumed we would generate more revenues than we did.

The previous speaker said that in 1981, we made these changes. In 1986, we made tax changes. And if we had been able to dynamically score and increase the rosy scenario even greater, we would have suggested even more revenue come in.

Look at what happened right after 1981, when we assumed that all of these tax reductions would increase revenue. They overestimated revenues.

I submit that the facts suggest that CBO already overestimates. Let us not create even more rosy scenarios. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, offered by the distinguished gentleman from California.

I leave others to point out the technical reasons why this amendment should be opposed. I would like to focus on the practical impact.

The clear intent of this amendment is to encourage more optimistic assumptions about

Federal revenues and expenditures, in the projections made by the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

Before we do so, let us look at the historical record. Over the last 15 years, we have seen our national debt soar from \$1 to \$5 billion. Annual deficits have been out of control.

Let us look at the accuracy of our projections by CBO over this period. With the exception of the last few years, the CBO has consistently and dramatically underestimated budget deficits. In fact, it did so for 13 consecutive years, with an average underestimate of \$42 billion.

Some years, the difference was astounding. In 1990, CBO projections underestimated the deficit by \$119 billion. In 1983, the underestimate was \$91 billion. As CBO's annual Budget Outlook shows, these underestimates reflect both a consistent underestimate of spending and an overestimate of revenues.

Thus, in a period in which deficits have skyrocketed, and which CBO has chronically underestimated our deficits, we are contemplating an amendment which would exaggerate CBO's tendency to use overly rosy projections.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent several months last year extolling the virtues of CBO projections, of using conservative estimates. They strongly attacked the administration for using less conservative assumptions.

Now, in a remarkable about face, we are considering a proposal to use less conservatives, less reliable projections of Federal spending and revenues. Budget expert after budget expert have criticized this approach.

With month's passage of a budget that actually increases the deficit each of the next 2 years, it is clear that we are retreating from a policy of fiscal discipline. Let us not turn this retreat into a rout.

Vote down the Campbell amendment.

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

To my friend from Utah, is it his statement, is the gentleman informing the body that CBO, under present estimation techniques, has gotten it wrong in every year that he has for us on the chart?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ORTON. What this chart shows is that in each year, the CBO has underestimated deficits up until 1993, which they overestimated the deficit. About half, look at 1990, they underestimated the deficit by \$119 billion. Half of that was revenue.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, is not the point of the gentleman's chart that under present methods of estimation, CBO has it wrong every year that he shows us?

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, CBO has it wrong, but under the gentleman's proposal CBO would have it even more wrong and we would have even higher deficits.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, we are adding to the information store. There is no way we can do harm by providing additional sources of information.

As my good friend from Utah just admitted, the present system is so bad we have been estimating wrongly every time. In order to take account of both sides in this debate, this dynamic method is applicable to fiscal as well as tax policy. It is being used in three States.

□ 1430

The errors in the observations that have been made in opposition to this amendment are simply these. We cannot do worse by getting more information. We are not substituting dynamic modeling for the present system, and I have no better criticism of the present system than the words my colleague from Utah made clear to all of us: The present system has got it wrong every year we can measure.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes, the balance of my time, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what this is about is very simple. It is about giving away goodies without having found a way to pay for them. We have seen time and time again that our Republican friends in this Congress want to propose to cut taxes for the wealthy and for special interests. It has been their No. 1 priority. The problem is that they keep running into a situation in which the commonsense budget rules require them to pay for any tax reductions that they provide.

We saw last year how the Republicans would like to pay for those tax breaks. They wanted to cut Medicare, they wanted to cut education, they wanted to cut school lunches; the American people objected. And so now what are we back to? We are back to the resurrection of the David Stockman rosy scenario business.

I would remind my colleagues what happened the last time the country used dynamic scoring. We were promised by David Stockman, who ran the budget office for President Reagan, that if we passed his magic budget which cut taxes and raised defense spending, we would cut our deficit from \$55 billion to zero within 4 years. Instead, using his dynamic scoring, that deficit went up from \$55 billion to \$208 billion, and finally they shaved it a bit to \$185 billion.

I would simply suggest, if we were not paying for the added deficits that were added during those Reagan years, this budget would be in balance right now. That is the problem, that is the problem, and this amendment will simply take us back to those good old rosy scenario days when we use phony estimates on revenue, and that allows us to spend more money on other things. We dare not do that if we want to remain fiscally responsible or even retain a pretension at fiscal responsibility.

I would simply say experience, as my colleagues know, is that quality which enables us to recognize a mistake when we make it again, and, if passed, this amendment today will be making the

same mistake again. I urge my colleagues not to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT: Page 35 after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 310. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1.9 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Is there a Member seeking time in opposition?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek that 10 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield 5 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

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

There was no objection.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today we heard a powerful speech from the new prime minister from Israel, Mr. Netanyahu. In it he said that real democracy allows dissent and honest debate, and we are here today to offer some dissent and honest debate. A few months ago, when we were adopting, in fact about a month ago when we were adopting, the budget resolution, we were rightly criticized by Members and leadership on the other side of the aisle for allowing the deficit to go up, and as one of the freshmen who came here promising to do what we could to balance this budget, to balance the people's budget, I was one who really felt we made a terrible mistake by allowing spending to go up more this year than we had agreed we would do just last year, and so, as a result, I and some of my fresh-

men colleagues sat down and said, well, what can we do? It is not enough just to vote no. We ought to have a constructive plan to help recover that fumble.

By our calculations what really happened is we have allowed ourselves to agree to spending levels that are about \$4.1 billion more than we agreed to last year in our 7-year budget plan. What I am offering today is the same amendment that we have offered to virtually every appropriation bill since the adoption of the conference committee report on the budget resolution, and that is to reduce overall spending across the board 1.9 percent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is less than one notch in a belt. In fact, if I compare that to a haircut, and what we are asking the legislature to do is to reduce its expenditures by 1.9 percent, if we compare to that a haircut, that is a haircut of less than 1/8 of an inch.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, that is not much of a haircut, and I think we should lead by example, and I would hope that we can get this amendment agreed to and that we can all agree to make at least some sacrifice in terms of balancing the people's books.

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

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

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

If this subcommittee had not done its job effectively, I could probably agree to this amendment. But there is no subcommittee on appropriations that has done a better job of cutting itself and all the agencies that it represents better than this subcommittee. We have cut ourselves, the legislative branch of Government, almost 12 percent between last year and this year. We have gone far beyond what the intent of the author of this amendment would have asked us to do last year and this year, and to ask us now to absorb another 2 or almost 2 percent cut across the board I think would cut deeply into programs and agencies that simply the Congress would be ill advised to cut.

I think the first point I would like to make is that an across-the-board cut is not a good way to prioritize our spending programs. It is a lousy way to prioritize, frankly. But we have not used that as our procedure. We have funded those programs in this bill that ought to be funded at level funding. We have cut those programs that ought to be cut, and we have done a very responsible job, I believe, in doing it in an orderly way.

But this would cut the Library of Congress in ways we would have to have a hundred library employees fired. We have asked the library to cut back in their staffing, and they have done so, but they have done it in an orderly way, and this would eliminate the ability to fund the increases, the mandatory increases, for staff COLA's in our offices and in all of the agencies that

we represent in this bill. Some 28,000 copyrights would not be registered, and that would be unconscionable, I think, in the Library of Congress; 2,800 Braille books and 88,000 sound recordings would not be made available to the blind and handicapped patrons of the library.

The House Appropriation Committee has already eliminated unnecessary legislative funding and programs. We have cut ourselves \$262 million over the past 2 years. I do not know why they are asking us to make further cuts when we are the model of cutting in the entire appropriating process.

I would hope that the House would reject this amendment. It will have, I think, personal effects upon our own offices and our staffs, but more importantly it will eliminate programs and cut programs deeper than what we feel is necessary and useful.

Incidentally, our bill comes in at 18 percent below the 602(b) outlay target and 23 percent below the 602(b) budget authority target, Senate items excluded. How can our colleagues ask us to do any better than that?

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

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I join the chairman of the committee in vigorous opposition to this amendment which transforms what is a studied, careful, and heavy reduction in appropriations into one which can have a very detrimental effect.

I am an airplane pilot, and I know that when I get up into the air in an airplane I pull back gently on the mixture control in order to get an efficient, good-running hot engine to pull me through the air while using the least amount of fuel. But there comes a point, Mr. Chairman, where by pulling that mixture control back just a little too far, there is silence—when the engine stops running because the fuel has been cut too much. We do not need to take that drastic measure with regard to the very important functioning of the legislative branch of Government.

We have cut this branch by over 20 percent in numbers of employees over the past 5 years. It is exemplary of what we should be doing throughout the Government, and the reason that we are upon this path of a balanced budget is because the legislative branch is doing its duty under the Constitution. We do not need to make across-the-board cuts which cut funds for books for the blind, which cut funds for COLA increases for valuable employees of the legislative branch of Government. This amendment would impose radical cuts across the board instead of singling out particular cuts that should be made.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], my freshman colleague.

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

Mr. COBURN. As my colleagues know, it is interesting. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and his committee have done a good job. This debate is not about whether or not they have done a good job. It is whether or not we can let us not do a better job.

We have the greatest respect for what the gentleman from California and his committee have done. But as my colleagues know, it is these 2 pennies. It is can we save 2 pennies? Can we be 2 percent more efficient? Can we do more?

I have been in Washington 19 months, and what I have heard is "can't." The fact is that the debt that our children, our children and grandchildren, are going to get to pay back is rising at the rate of \$2.785 billion a day, and what we are saying is: 2 percent. Now, if we were at war right now and we got together as a country and said we have an objective, the objective is to defeat the enemy, well, we have an enemy in front of us as a Nation, and that enemy is our deficit and our debt.

Two percent, 1.9 percent; 2 pennies out of every dollar to preserve opportunity for our children; it is not too much to ask. The two gentlemen that are speaking in favor of this amendment ran their offices for \$100,000 less than the Congressmen before them in spite of the fact this past year, in spite of the fact that we had a reduction in the opportunity for more. So the point, I would say, is we can effectively represent our districts, we can effectively accomplish what we need to accomplish by being 2 percent more efficient.

The fact is in this bill spending goes up about 1.9 percent over last year, and what we are asking is to freeze the spending, essentially a 2-percent cut in the bill, pulling things down so that our children and our children's children will not be enslaved by debt. \$2.785 billion a day because this Congress will not live within its limits of the money that comes to it.

When I leave this place, I want to be able to say that I did everything that I could to ensure opportunity and preserve opportunity for my children and the children that are from my district.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I think I need to correct one misunderstanding that apparently the gentleman has got in this amendment. We are cutting this year 2.2 percent in addition to last year's cuts of 9.5 percent. We are not increasing 1-point-something percent at all. In fact, we are cutting this bill. If every committee and every program in the Government cut to the extent this bill cuts, the Federal budget would be in balance

this year and there would be a \$100 billion surplus.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, that would be a great thing.

□ 1445

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding time to me, and I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. The fact is that this bill does cut 2.2 percent or \$37.4 million already. We can pick up a pocket of change and say all we are talking about is 1 percent, 2 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, it does not mean anything. When we look in terms of whether or not it is Library of Congress jobs, or jobs on the staff of your office or, in other bills it is Indian reservation jobs, or in other bills water project jobs, the fact is that we are talking about real and meaningful people who are going to be cut here. The question is, can we do the job?

Look, the U.S. Congress is paring down the discretionary budget in all 13 appropriations bills for the first time in modern times. We have saved \$20 billion in fiscal year 1995, \$23 billion in fiscal year 1996, and we are on the way to saving \$15 billion to \$20 billion in fiscal year 1997. If we look at where the President would have had us, if he had a Congress like he had 2 years ago, we are saving about \$80 billion in the discretionary budget.

I heard the argument of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He is not concerned about the discretionary budget. We are doing the job. The problem is in the mandatory side of the equation. We have not done the first thing on mandatory. That is the problem. If Members want to do something constructive for their constituents, go back and tell them how we can figure out how to save our citizens, to save our children and the economy of this country by restraining the mandatory spending of this Government.

We are already doing the job here. For that reason, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my freshman colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend this subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, on their efforts on discretionary. It is indeed unfortunate that we are not dealing with the mandatory spending. But

the fact is that unless something miraculous happens, we are not going to deal with the mandatory spending, so we are forced to deal with the discretionary spending.

In the budget resolution many of us were concerned that there was a bump-up in the second year, so 1.9 percent off of all the appropriations bills would eliminate that bump-up. This is not aimed at any particular committee. It is very easy to demagog on House expenditures. Probably if we put this to a vote in the general public, they would cut us 80 percent.

At the same time, the truth is that there needs to be functions here, and 1.9 percent will not devastate our ability to communicate to our constituents, it will not devastate our ability to convert to computers. We are spending \$211 million on that, 12 percent of the full funding. A 1.9-percent change there would not devastate our ability to do what we need to do, which is to be able to move into the age of the computer communications, the Internet.

We can deal with this. If we can deal with 1.9 percent changes and bigger changes in social spending, if we can deal with those 1.9 percent cuts in other areas, we can deal with it in legislative appropriations. It is inconsistent for this Congress to say that we will cut everybody else and we will put the pressure on everybody else, but we will not put that much on ourselves. A 2.2-percent cut is commendable and better than we have done in the past, but we can do more than that, and we need to be willing to sacrifice if we are going to eliminate the budget deficit.

In Indiana, they do not understand why it has taken us 7 years. We should be able to balance our budget in a lot shorter than that. To deal with that, unless we deal with mandatory, we have to do more out of discretionary. I do not believe 1.9 percent will devastate our ability to communicate.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota, who has been persistent in spite of pressures with this. Persistence is one of the traits that Minnesotans develop because of the cold weather. I think the persistence in SPAN, which is in his district, are the two things which gave him that special courage.

We are going to continue to do this because we believe it is critical to our children and to this Nation to a move to a balanced budget. It is important that we in the legislative branch take the initiative. This 1.9 percent plus 2.2 is a 4.1 percent reduction. That is not going to cripple our ability to communicate, to do committees, or our personal work.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment. I do so reluc-

tantly, because I feel I am a very strong fiscal conservative. I think my record, both on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, will demonstrate that. But this is not the way to do it.

Across-the-board cuts did not work when we had Gramm-Rudman. We need to make the tough choices. That is what we are doing in the Committee on Appropriations, making tough choices in all the appropriations bills. We have made those tough choices. Going across the board in addition is not the way to go, especially for this specific appropriation bill, because in this appropriation bill we have cut over 10 percent from the 1995 numbers. We have cut in real dollars, not baseline cutting, but real dollar cuts. So to cut more, are we going to cut security in the Capitol? We have made those tough choices and decided how many security we are going to need. We do not need to have additional cuts like this. I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida just referred to Gramm-Rudman. I think that is a great example. That is an example of a plan that did not work. The reason it did not work is because Congress did not have the courage to stay with the plan. What this amendment is about and what all the amendments we have offered to all the other appropriations bills is about is keeping faith with the plan we offered last year.

The gentleman from California is absolutely right, they have done a good job. We are actually reducing the cost of operating this Congress. But the truth is that we are still increasing the amount we are going to spend on ourselves by 1.9 percent over what we said we were going to spend last year. This amendment is a good faith amendment. It is about keeping faith with the people of this country. It is about keeping faith with our kids.

Mr. Chairman, 1.9 percent, as I said earlier, is like getting a haircut of one-eighth of an inch. You would not even notice it. We would not notice it in this bill, frankly. We may have to buy less computers. Many of us are operating our budgets at \$100,000 less than we were authorized to earlier.

I talked about Prime Minister Netanyahu. I do not always remember who gave this quote. I want to close with this quote. I do not remember who said it. He said, if you want to change the world, you have to first change your neighborhood. If you cannot change your neighborhood, at least you ought to be a good example.

This is about setting a good example. If we are serious about balancing the books of the people of the United States of America, if we are serious

about saving the future and the American dream for our kids, then we have to be willing to tighten our belts. This is about setting a good example with the Congress itself, with our own legislative appropriation. It is only 1.9 percent, and I believe there is not a Member in this body who does not believe we cannot tighten our belts that small fraction.

Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped we would have had bipartisan support on this. I think this is a good example. I hope all Members will join us in supporting this simple and very, very innocuous amendment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to yield my 1 remaining minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise very reluctantly in opposition to the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. I do not know about the other areas of the appropriations package. I do know about the legislative branch. I worked very, very closely with the gentleman from California, and look at where we have gone.

I do want to correct slightly the gentleman's numbers. In fiscal year 1995 it was \$1.9 billion. Last year it was \$1.72 billion. This year it is \$1.68. Those are declining real numbers every year. Last year, because it was larger, we cut \$154 million. We cut the committees by one-third when we came in, saving \$67 million. This year, notwithstanding one-third of a cut in committees, the gentleman from California sharpened his pencil and came up with another \$37.4 million reduction over last year. We are talking about real reductions over last year, not reducing the increase. We do not play that game. This is a new majority. It is an absolute reduction. It is not a mindless across the board. It was focused on where we could cut. I support the gentleman generally, but not in this particular instance.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], the former president of the freshman class, and also a very, very dedicated and useful member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] I recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although it is well intended. The legislative subcommittee has already done its work. The gentleman from Oklahoma held up two pennies and said, "We are just asking for about a 2-percent cut." Mr. Chairman, we have made that 2 percent cut. As a matter of fact, this bill represents a 2.2-percent cut from last year's level as the gentleman from California pointed out, that is not a cut in the rate of increase or a cut in the percentage in which we are spending extra money, that is a real cut,

\$37.4 million in reductions. The gentleman who offers this amendment does so because the budget allocation was higher across the board than he wanted. I would simply point out to the gentleman that in our subcommittee, we have reduced the budget outlay by 20 percent below the budget allocation for this bill. This Congress is leading by example. We have done the work. We have saved the money. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 473, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASTLE) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 104-663.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. CASTLE: Page 35, after line 22, insert the following new section.

SEC. 310. (a) Each mass mailing sent by a Member of the House of Representatives shall bear in a prominent place on its face, or on the envelope or outside cover or wrapper in which the mail matter is sent, the following notice: "THIS MAILING WAS PREPARED, PUBLISHED, AND MAILED AT TAXPAYER EXPENSE.", or a notice to the same effect in words which may be prescribed under subsection (c). The notice shall be printed in a type size not smaller than 7-point.

(b)(1) There shall be published in the itemized report of disbursements of the House of Representatives as required by law, a summary tabulation setting forth, for the office of each Member of the House of Representatives, the total number of pieces of mass mail mailed during the period involved and the total cost of those mass mailings.

(2) Each such tabulation shall also include—

(A) the total cost (as referred to in paragraph (1)) divided by the number (as deter-

mined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the Congressional district from which the Member was elected (as such addresses are described in section 3210(d)(7)(B) of title 39, United States Code); and

(B) the total number of pieces of mass mail (as referred to in paragraph (1)) divided by the number (as determined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the Congressional district from which the Member was elected (as such addresses are described in section 3210(d)(7)(B) of title 39, United States Code).

(c) The Committee on House Oversight shall prescribe such rules and regulations and shall take such other action as the Committee considers necessary and proper for Members to conform to the provisions of this subsection and applicable rules and regulations.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "Member of the House of Representatives" means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress; and

(2) the term "mass mailing" has the meaning given such term by section 3210(a)(6)(E) of title 39, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to start my congratulating the chairman for what I think has been an excellent job of trimming the legislative appropriations, and particularly in the area that I am going to talk about, which is the taxpayer funding of franked mail.

The fiscal year 1997 level of funding will be 40 percent lower than the 1996 level of funding. That is an impressive reduction. I do not even know if the chairman is aware of the reductions over the course of years, but starting in the year I was first elected to this body, before I came here in 1992, it was \$59 million. In 1993 it went to \$47,711,000. In 1994 it went to \$40 million, in 1995 to \$31 million, in 1996 it went up to \$35,630,000, and this year is an appropriation of \$20 million, so it really is an extraordinary job that the chairman has done and that the Committee on House Oversight has done in addressing this particular situation.

In recognition of that, I do not intend, as I have in the past, to introduce an amendment to try to further reduce that funding. I think there are a couple of areas for which there is still room for improvement. Too often the franking privilege is not treated as a privilege and is abused. For example, the volume of outgoing franked mail vastly outpaces the volume of incoming mail.

In 1995, the House sent out four times more mail than it received. If the House had responded only to letters it received, franked mail costs would have been only \$12.4 million, saving \$18.6 million or 60 percent from actual mail costs. Also, use of the frank in-

creases cyclically during every election year. During the 102d Congress, the House spent \$31 million in 1991 and \$54 million in 1992, and during the 103d Congress, \$24 million in 1993, and \$42 million in 1994.

□ 1500

The 104th Congress again has addressed and narrowed this gap in total spending, but the irresistible temptation for individual Members facing tough reelection campaigns to use their franking perk extensively in election years remains.

I think Members have a legitimate need to respond to the increasing concerns of their constituents and the franking privilege does facilitate this. I think the public understands this and would support that use of taxpayer dollars.

Unsolicited mass mail from Members, however, I think fails into a different category. I believe that most Americans do not want to receive all the unsolicited mail they get from Congress, particularly if they are aware of the fact that they as taxpayers pay for it themselves. Some Members here, I am certain, would disagree and would argue that the newsletter contains valuable and useful information. I am not trying to prevent that from being used. But I think we should give the public the information it needs to make the determination.

This is what the amendment, the taxpayer's right to know amendment, will do.

It has two components, both of which are based on procedures which the Senate already follows. The first component would require all mass mailings to contain the disclaimer, "This mailing was prepared, published, and mailed at taxpayer expense." This will encourage Members to be more judicious in the mass mailing they send to their constituents, and it is entirely consistent with this Congress's attempt to let sunshine disinfect the policy process.

The second part of the amendment would require the CAO's quarterly Statement of Disbursements to publish to total number of pieces of mass mail mailed during the period involved and the total cost of those mass mailings on a per-residential-address basis. Currently there is no way for the public to get information about the amount Members spend on unsolicited mass mailings versus constituent response mail. My amendment will allow this comparison to take place and I think the public has a right to know how their tax dollars are being spent.

The bottom line here is that this simple amendment will provide information to taxpayers about franked mass mail. It does not ban mass mailings or change the definition from current law. It simply requires public disclosure about the use of frank for mass mail.

I urge Members to pass this amendment.