

Johnson (CT) Morella  
 Johnson, Sam Myers  
 Jones Myrick  
 Kasich Nethercutt  
 Kelly Neumann  
 Kim Ney  
 King Norwood  
 Kingston Nussle  
 Klug Oxley  
 Knollenberg Packard  
 Kolbe Parker  
 LaHood Paxon  
 Largent Peterson (MN)  
 Latham Petri  
 LaTourette Pombo  
 Laughlin Porter  
 Lazio Portman  
 Leach Pryce  
 Lewis (CA) Quillen  
 Lewis (KY) Quinn  
 Lightfoot Radanovich  
 Linder Ramstad  
 Livingston Regula  
 LoBiondo Riggs  
 Lucas Roberts  
 Manzullo Rogers  
 Martini Rohrabacher  
 McCollum Ros-Lehtinen  
 McCrery Roth  
 McHugh Roukema  
 McNinis Royce  
 McIntosh Salmon  
 McKeon Sanford  
 Metcalf Saxton  
 Meyers Scarborough  
 Mica Schaefer  
 Miller (FL) Schiff  
 Molinari Seastrand  
 Moorhead Sensenbrenner

## NOT VOTING—12

Clay Gutierrez Longley  
 Dunn Hayes McDade  
 Ford Lantos Watt (NC)  
 Gibbons Lincoln Young (FL)

□ 1644

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Linder with Mr. Longley against.  
 Mr. Clay with Ms. Dunn of Washington against.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 58, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—360

Abercrombie Bevil Buyer  
 Ackerman Bilbray Callahan  
 Allard Bilirakis Calvert  
 Archer Bishop Camp  
 Arney Bileley Campbell  
 Bachus Blumenauer Canady  
 Baesler Blute Cardin  
 Baker (CA) Boehlert Castle  
 Baker (LA) Boehner Chabot  
 Baldacci Bonilla Chambliss  
 Ballenger Bonior Chapman  
 Barcia Bono Christensen  
 Barr Borski Chryslers  
 Barrett (NE) Boucher Clayton  
 Barrett (WI) Brewster Clement  
 Bartlett Browder Clinger  
 Barton Brown (CA) Clyburn  
 Bass Brown (OH) Coburn  
 Bateman Brownback Coleman  
 Becerra Bryant (TN) Collins (GA)  
 Beilenson Bunn Combest  
 Bentsen Bunning Costello  
 Bereuter Burr Cox  
 Berman Burton Coyne

Cramer  
 Crane  
 Crapo  
 Cremeans  
 Cubin  
 Cummings  
 Cunningham  
 Davis  
 de la Garza  
 Deal  
 DeFazio  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dickey  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Dixon  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Dornan  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Durbin  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 English  
 Ensign  
 Eshoo  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Fawell  
 Fazio  
 Fields (LA)  
 Fields (TX)  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Flanagan  
 Foglietta  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Fowler  
 Fox  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (CT)  
 Franks (NJ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frisa  
 Frost  
 Funderburk  
 Furse  
 Gallegly  
 Gajdenson  
 Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Geren  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Greene (UT)  
 Greenwood  
 Gunderson  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hansen  
 Harman  
 Hastert  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Hefner  
 Heineman  
 Herger  
 Hilleary  
 Hinchey  
 Hobson  
 Hoekstra  
 Hoke  
 Holden  
 Horn  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter

Hutchinson  
 Inglis  
 Istook  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Johnson, E.B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kasich  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy (MA)  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kennelly  
 Kildee  
 Kim  
 King  
 Kingston  
 Kleczka  
 Klink  
 Klug  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 LaFalce  
 LaHood  
 Largent  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Laughlin  
 Lazio  
 Leach  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lightfoot  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 Livingston  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luther  
 Maloney  
 Manton  
 Manzullo  
 Martinez  
 Martini  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCollum  
 McCrery  
 McHale  
 McHugh  
 McNinis  
 McIntosh  
 McKeon  
 McKinney  
 McNulty  
 Menendez  
 Meyers  
 Mica  
 Millender  
 McDonald  
 Miller (FL)  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Molinari  
 Mollohan  
 Montgomery  
 Moorhead  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myers  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Neal  
 Nethercutt  
 Ney  
 Norwood  
 Nussle  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Pastor  
 Paxon  
 Payne (NJ)  
 Payne (VA)

## NAYS—58

Andrews  
 Brown (FL)  
 Bryant (TX)  
 Chenoweth  
 Coble  
 Collins (IL)  
 Collins (MI)  
 Condit  
 Conyers  
 Cooley  
 Danner  
 Dellums  
 Doggett  
 Engel  
 Fattah  
 Ganske  
 Green (TX)  
 Hamilton  
 Hancock  
 Hilliard  
 Jacobs  
 Johnston  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Markey  
 McDermott  
 Meehan  
 Meek  
 Metcalf  
 Miller (CA)  
 Minge  
 Moran  
 Neumann  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Orton  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Roemer  
 Royce

## NOT VOTING—15

Clay Hayes McDade  
 Dunn Hyde Smith (TX)  
 Ford Lantos Watt (NC)  
 Gibbons Lincoln Waxman  
 Gutierrez Longley Young (FL)

□ 1652

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 472 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 472

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declared the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 (l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 302 or 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. The Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies always involves some controversy and usually involves much heated debate. Issues such as abortion, labor policy, the Federal role in education, stir passions and invite dialogue.

I am therefore, very pleased that the rule before us is completely open. Any Member who wishes to offer a germane amendment may do so.

Also, in the interest of comity and in recognition of the legitimate differences of opinion over some of the fundamental aspects of this bill, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to double usual time for general debate to 2 full hours, as requested by the ranking member the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and we acceded to that request.

In addition, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone or roll votes, a step we have taken on many bills recently which has helped, I think, provide for a smoother and more predictable schedule for Members in committee with important business taking place off the House floor.

Finally, the rule includes a preprinting option, I repeat, option, for the benefit of Members who file their amendments in advance. It is not mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, there will certainly be very comprehensive debate about the specifics of this bill. In fact, I think some of it has already started on the

other side. I will not spend a lot of time previewing those discussions because this is about the rule.

I would, however, like to thank Chairman PORTER and his committee for the good work they have done to bring this bill to the floor. This legislation, as we will all recall, was indeed a lighting rod last year, and I think most of us will also remember it spent much time being stalled in the other body.

I think most Members will recognize the effort that has been made this year to produce a solid bill, one that is free from many of the controversial policy riders that hindered the progress in the fiscal year 1996 bill, a real effort that deserves our attention. While H.R. 3755 fully complies with the strict limits needed to reach a balanced budget by 2002, that is, it is on the budget glide path, discretionary funding is nevertheless up \$2.4 billion, almost \$2.5 billion in additional, increased spending in this bill.

□ 1700

Although we undoubtedly will hear the charge from the defenders of big government that we are not spending enough, we will never be spending enough for some people. Instead of the old approach of funding all government programs, those big and small, good and bad, at equally high levels, which was the way we did business around here for a long time, which got us into such fiscal problems as we are having now, this new Congress, under the new majority management, has set priorities for this bill this time, providing adequate funding for those programs that were effective and do the most good, programs such as Head Start, and reduced or eliminated the tax dollars going to wasteful or ineffective or out-of-date or off-the-mark programs; Goals 2000 is one that comes to mind.

This is simple, common sense, the same common sense exercised by families at the kitchen table every day as they plan their own family finances, or by shoppers at the supermarket as they go about the business of buying their necessities.

I am pleased that we have been able to instill some of that restraint here in this bill. Americans are asking for that restraint. Americans are used to that type of restraint in their own affairs, and they are demanding that type of restraint for the people who represent them in this, the House of the people, where all funding bills start.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule. It is a good rule. We do not ever get a better rule than this rule unless we are opposed to open rules.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has given us a good rule for a bad bill. But Mr. Speaker, giving the House an open rule for this appropriation is essentially a meaningless gesture because, for the second year in a row,

there is simply no way to fix this bill by amendment. Piecemeal amendments will not turn this sow's ear into anything but a sow's ear.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has, in this appropriation, made a very bold statement about their priorities. For the second year in a row, the Republican majority want to cut, slash and eliminate programs that aid families, provide educational opportunity, ensure workplace safety, and protect our children's health.

For the second year in a row, the Republican majority has recommended appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education which ignore the priorities of the American people: jobs, education and training, and health and safety. The Republican majority wants to cut these critical programs to balance the budget. The Republicans want to reduce the number of Head Start slots available for disadvantaged children, to cut summer youth employment, to reduce the availability of student loans and grants, and to cut the funds that make computers and links to the information superhighway available to schools throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to balance the budget, but I do not want to do it on the backs of working families and school kids. But the Republican majority is asking us to do just that. The majority wants to make cuts that in the short term look good on paper, but in the long term will do great harm.

These cuts are not just shortsighted, Mr. Speaker, they are foolish. We cannot expect our economy to grow if our work force is undereducated. We cannot expect our businesses and industry to compete in the worldwide marketplace if our workers do not have adequate training. But, the cuts in job training in the bill will take away opportunities for displaced workers to retrain and for new workers to train for the jobs of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no way to fix this bill. The Appropriations Committee ranking member, Mr. OBEY, stated this yesterday when the Rules Committee met to consider a rule for this appropriation. At his request, the Rules Committee has provided 2 hours of general debate so that the House can fully air the differences in priorities between the majority and the minority. This debate promises to be only a beginning of yet another long-term debate between the Republican majority in the House of Representatives and those of us who want to ensure that American priorities in jobs, education and training, and health and safety are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

I do so knowing that there are honorable people who serve on the Committee on Rules, and that by and large they try to do the right thing every time. But I can tell my colleagues in this instance the Committee on Rules acted somewhat out of character when a bill that has been sponsored by 8 of the 13 members of the Committee on Rules that I tried to offer as an amendment to this bill was defeated in the very same Committee on Rules, by and large, by the eight people who sponsored the bill.

The bill is all about keeping promises. The bill is all about changing the way Congress does business. First to the promises. When we think about it, the only people in America who were really promised free health care were those people who enlisted in the military when their recruiter told them, if you serve our country honorably for 20 years or more, at the end of that period of time, you will be given free care in a military health facility for you and your spouse for the rest of your life.

That promise was made in the 1930's. It was made in the 1940's. It was made in the 1950's. And I can assure my colleagues that on June 25, 1971, in the Customs House on Canal Street in New Orleans, LA, it was made to me. I did not serve for 20 years, and, therefore, I do not deserve free health care. But there are a heck of a lot of people who served for 20 years, 30 years, who fought in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, most recently Desert Storm, Panama and Grenada who had their enlistment officer tell them just that and who, effective on July 1 of this year, upon reaching the age of 65 when they showed up at the military hospital for the treatment they had been receiving for years were told we cannot take you anymore. You have to go to a private doctor. Medicare will reimburse some of those costs, but not all of those costs.

So, now at the point in their life where they cannot go back to work because they are over 65 and not very many people hire people over 65, where they thought they had been promised free health care for the rest of their lives, they were being told they are not. They are being told that now they have to dig into their pocket.

Now, sometimes it is not a whole lot of money if it is just a common cold.

But what if it is something like leukemia? What if it is something like cancer? What if it is a serious heart condition that involves not dozens of dollars but tens if not thousands of dollars? Now they have to pay, and they have to pay dearly for something that our Nation promised them.

The amendment that I would like to offer is really not my idea. It is the brainchild of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and it is cosponsored by almost 270 Members of this body. It is cosponsored by both the chairman and the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is cosponsored by the chairman and ranking member of the National Security Committee. It is cosponsored by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It is cosponsored by myself, and it was a part of the Blue Dog coalition budget because we think it is important that this Nation keep our promises.

When brought before the Committee on Rules with all of the things that I have just told my colleagues, the importance of keeping promises, the importance of this Congress, of any Congress ever before keeping its word to the American people, in particular keeping our word to those people who have given the most to our country, the Committee on Rules voted in a party line vote, I am sorry to say, not to bring it before this body. That is wrong and it is time we changed things.

If Members recall, 1½ years ago a group of people were swept into office with the promise that no more business as usual, no more letting parliamentary rules keeping the right thing from happening, no more losing the forest for the sake of a couple of trees. Today is an opportunity for those people to keep their word.

Today is an opportunity for the 270 people who cosponsored this bill to put their vote where they put their signature, and that is to defend the rights of our military retirees who served this country so well, who kept their part of the bargain. And all they ask in return is for our Nation to keep its word. As I said before, they are the only people in this country who were promised health care. Prior to Medicare and Medicaid coming along, they were the only people who got health care. And now is it

not ironic that the people who dodged the draft, that the people who may even be here illegally get free health care? But the people who paid with 6 months at a time at sea on aircraft carriers and submarines, the people who lost limbs, the people who lost their vision, the people who were away from their families, whose families split up because they were away defending our country, they are not getting the health care they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is wrong. It needs to be defeated, and we need to give those veterans of our country, our military retirees, what they were promised.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman from Mississippi, who is my friend and the substance of whose bill I very much support, even though I am sorry to say I am not a cosponsor primarily because I wasn't aware of the substance of all the bill until yesterday, has been guided on how to go about accomplishing his mission, observing the rules and the protocols of the House. The first we have heard about this and the first I had heard about this was last night as we were in the Rules meeting.

It just so happens that through an agreement in the protocol between both parties, the minority and the majority on this, we were not able to stick to our protocols in the Committee on Rules and make him in order. However, there were other options for him to pursue without disrupting what I think is a good, open rule for us to get on with the debate with one of the major appropriations bills that has the funding for major agencies of the Federal Government and a great many people who are depending on the activities of those agencies.

It seems to me the right way to deal with that is through the established rules and protocols of the House, and we have been happy to provide that information to the gentleman from Mississippi and I hope he will follow that course and he will have my support if he does.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

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

[As of July 10, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-Open <sup>2</sup> .....	46	44	77	60
Structured/Modified Closed <sup>3</sup> .....	49	47	34	27
Closed <sup>4</sup> .....	9	9	17	13
Total .....	104	100	128	100

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

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

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

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

## SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 10, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-199; A: 227-197 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)				A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	O	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	O			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	MC	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PO: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth.	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PO: 231-194; A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PO: 235-184; A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PO: 228-191; A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 249-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PO: 223-183; A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	PO: 221-197; A: voice vote (5/15/96).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PO: 230-188; A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PO: 228-182; A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	Tabled (4/17/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PO: voice vote; A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	C	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251-157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PO: 233-152; A: voice vote (3/19/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PO: 234-187; A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/21/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PO: 232-180; A: 232-177 (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PO: 229-186; A: voice vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	O	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PO: 232-168; A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	MC	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	C	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PO: 219-203; A: voice vote (5/1/96).

## SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 10, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422-0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218-208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth.	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235-149 (5/10/96).
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	PQ: 227-196 A: voice vote (5/16/96).
H. Res. 436 (5/16/96)	C	H.R. 3415	Repeal 4.3 cent fuel tax	PQ: 221-181 A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 437 (5/16/96)	MO	H.R. 3259	Intell. Auth. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 438 (5/16/96)	MC	H.R. 3144	Defend America Act	
H. Res. 440 (5/21/96)	MC	H.R. 3448	Small Bus. Job Protection	A: 219-211 (5/22/96).
	MC	H.R. 1227	Employee Commuting Flexibility	
H. Res. 442 (5/29/96)	O	H.R. 3517	Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/30/96).
H. Res. 445 (5/30/96)	O	H.R. 3540	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/5/96).
H. Res. 446 (6/5/96)	MC	H.R. 3562	WI Works Waiver Approval	A: 363-59 (6/6/96).
H. Res. 448 (6/6/96)	MC	H.R. 2754	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement	A: voice vote (6/12/96).
H. Res. 451 (6/10/96)	O	H.R. 3603	Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/11/96).
H. Res. 453 (6/12/96)	O	H.R. 3610	Defense Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/13/96).
H. Res. 455 (6/18/96)	O	H.R. 3662	Interior Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/19/96).
H. Res. 456 (6/19/96)	O	H.R. 3666	VA/HUD Approps	A: 246-166 (6/25/96).
H. Res. 460 (6/25/96)	O	H.R. 3675	Transportation Approps	A: voice vote (6/26/96).
H. Res. 472 (7/9/96)	MC	H.R. 3755	Labor/HHS Approps	
H. Res. 473 (7/9/96)	O	H.R. 3754	Leg. Branch Approps	A: voice vote (7/10/96).

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of both the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, every hard working American family stands to benefit from the policies the Republican Congress is moving forward.

Despite the outrageous scare tactics and the "sky is falling" strategy of the Democrats, the future will be better for our children and our grandchildren.

We have successfully aimed to cut wasteful spending, reduce duplication, and lower taxes to get the Government out of our workers checkbooks. And with a balanced budget, lower interest rates will mean lower mortgages, lower car payments, and more affordable student loans.

We have pushed for welfare reform that rewards hard work and perseverance and returns the expectation of personal responsibility. The Democrats and President Clinton have only blown hot air at welfare reform while still pushing the same old spend-spend-spend welfare state.

Republicans have promoted workplace safety protections and pushed for better designed programs to help students go to college.

And if you really want to help working families, we'll cut their taxes and let them keep more of their hard-earned money rather than give them 90 cents an hour.

We've made solid progress to cut spending, balance the budget, and make this Government work better. This bill is an important part of the fight. So reject the deception and the distortions. Support the rule. It is a good rule. It is an open rule and support this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is about fairness, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] said earlier, and this is the only way we know to bring this matter to the floor at this time.

Military retirees and their dependents who are Medicare eligible over the age of 65 are now being forced out of the military health care system and on to Medicare. Under current law, the Department of Defense cannot be reimbursed by HCFA for treating Medicare-eligible retirees. Without Medicare reimbursement, the Retired Officers Association said these words: The DOD has no funding or financial incentive to treat military Medicare eligibles; thus, they are being shoved out of the military health care system and on to Medicare.

□ 1715

If that were not bad enough, CHAMPUS eligible beneficiaries who enroll are abruptly disenfranchised from Tricare when they become Medicare eligible.

After we looked at the Persian Gulf war 3 years ago and realized that we could have had a problem if as many people had gotten hurt as possibly could have, in treating them, we decided we ought to not persist in a drawdown of medical personnel and medical infrastructure in our active guard and reserve forces. And so at that time we passed MediGuard, allowing the Governors of the various States to select medically underserved areas in those States, and then we would use reserve and guard personnel to go and conduct what we would call, I suppose, defensive medicine, screening for high blood pressure and so forth, to keep that ready military medical infrastructure in place in case we have another situation like the Persian Gulf.

I am convinced that military medical readiness will suffer if these people are continued to be denied access to care. Our medical military system must attract, train, and retain physicians and other health care personnel if it is

going to be a capable and viable national resource for our defense.

Medicare subvention provides this institutional foundation which is needed to meet any contingency operation and will ensure that our military retirees have the freedom of choice in health care that they have earned, have been promised and deserve.

Now they say, well, this is out of order because we are in an open rule on Labor-HHS. This is telling HHS in this bill that they can reimburse the Department of Defense for these people. It is the same money, the same illnesses, the same medical people, but we do not force military retirees over the age of 65 out of military hospitals. That is just plain wrong.

There is a remedy under this bill to do it. If we could defeat this rule or the previous question, then we can have our amendment, which was denied us in the Committee on Rules, brought on the floor for a vote. That is all we ask.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we come again to a time when this Congress is offering to the American public the multistrike bill and everyone is out. I would have hoped that after last year we could have come to the table of compromise on the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill, but we find that this department is underfunded some \$6.15 billion below the President's request.

What strikes me the most is that we have given up on children by underfunding Head Start by \$38.1 million, which serves only 740,000 out of the two million children who are currently eligible for this important and effective early childhood program.

Just a couple of weeks ago I had the opportunity to be in California discussing the crisis of juvenile crime all over the Nation, and one thing that we were assured of or convinced of, as the

RAND study has indicated, that it is the upfront cost that will allow us to invest in Americans and prevent the incarceration of citizens in their later life.

I cannot understand my Republican colleagues for striking out Head Start once more and disallowing the numbers of children that need this service to not be served. Additionally, I cannot understand if this is a Nation of working people, supporting working Americans, that we would cut the dollars that promotes workplace safety and health and also pensions security.

Just yesterday, in a very grateful manner, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to support the increase in the minimum wage. We now in the House of Representatives will be dealing with a bill that says to the American workers that they are out. We strike them out on workplace safety, we strike them out in health care and we strike them out in pension security.

We have worked over the last 2 years to ensure that our young people have an appreciation for work. The Youth Summer Jobs Program has been one that I have personally taken charge to see that we respect the fact that young people care about work. We cut it in 1995, they cut it in fiscal year 1996, but yet we were able to see that it survived. Here we go again, we are now at 442,000 youth who cannot be served because of the cuts in the Youth Summer Jobs Program. I think it is important that we recognize that America is a country of inclusiveness.

I would say that, in addition to including our youth, we should recognize those who suffer from mental illness and drug abuse. The bill provides less funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The amount, \$1.85 billion, is an aggregated cut of \$33.9 million below the current funding level and is \$248 million below the administration's request.

Just for a moment, one of the things I have heard often when I have spoken to my health care providers in Texas is that mental health is an important issue. I think if we defeat this rule we will be able to support youth, children, and those who suffer from mental illness and substance abuse. I ask my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition today of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. While we should be investing more in education to give our children the tools of opportunity in order to succeed, the Gingrich Congress continues its assault on education.

The central theme of the leadership revolution has been to deny working families and children in this country educational opportunities at every level of their academic development. And this bill is more of the same.

The enrollment in public schools today is rising. Tuition costs for college are going through the roof and working families are being squeezed just to make ends meet. This Congress should be doing everything in its power to expand access to a college education, to maintain support for local schools, ensure that every child who walks into a classroom is healthy, fed, and ready to learn.

This bill does the exact opposite. It slashes education. That is dumb and it is wrong. Let me cite the blows inflicted by this bill.

Our national investment in elementary and secondary education is cut by \$400 million from last year's level. The bill kicks 15,000 children out of Head Start. It denies 150,000 children needed help in reading and mathematics for next year. The bill stops Federal funding of school reform. Goals 2000, which enables teachers to reform our schools, to discover innovative methods to improve the academic performance of all students, is eliminated under this bill. It slashes safe and drug-free schools, putting children in my district in New Haven, CT at risk of violence in their schools.

In higher education the bill would deny 191,000 students Pell Grants next year. The bill denies 96,000 deserving postsecondary students the opportunity to receive low-interest Perkins loans. It reduces funds to administer the direct lending program, limiting the number of loans available to students and working families for 14 colleges and universities in Connecticut.

The Gingrich revolutionaries just do not get it. We have been down this road before. The American people have spoken out loudly and clearly in opposition to an extreme Republican agenda, yet it has reared its ugly head once again in this bill. The American people understand that the only way that we move competitively into the 21st century is through an educated work force.

Educating our kids is primary to families today. Dismantling public education in this country is the wrong way to balance a budget. We should reject this all-out attack on education for middle-class Americans.

Some of my opponents say the Republicans have changed their tune from 4 months ago, found faith in America's public education. This is simply not true. I call on my colleagues to reject this extreme antieducation bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Judge PRYCE, a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida, Mr. GOSS, for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of both the rule and the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

First, this is another open rule. With the exception of the legislative branch appropriations bill, which we considered earlier today, all of the regular

spending bills that have come to the floor of the House this year have been considered under an open amendment process, and we continue that same spirit of unrestricted debate today.

Second, I'd like to commend Chairman PORTER for crafting a very responsible bill—one that keeps our commitment to preserving and protecting the health, welfare, and Social Security of the American people.

Although this year's bill freezes spending for many programs at last year's level, the bill does provide increased funding for education and Head Start, for block grants that support child care and community services, for the Violence Against Women Act, for the National Institutes of Health, and for valuable outreach and support programs like TRIO—which encourages young people in my district of Columbus, OH, to pursue a college education.

Even with the increased funding levels, Mr. Speaker, the bill is within the 602(b) allocation, and as our colleagues know, that is crucial to keeping us on the glidepath to a balanced Federal budget.

As we work to get our fiscal house in order, we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is most effective in our society. This bill achieves this important goal by emphasizing, among other things, local control, parental involvement, and basic academics.

Notwithstanding the challenge of balancing the Federal budget in 6 years, I believe H.R. 3755 makes the right kind of investment in education, job training, and health, while also shrinking the size of government and funding only those programs that have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HHS bill is one of the largest of the 13 annual spending bills, and under this open rule, we will have the opportunity to discuss spending priorities in a fair and open manner, and I look forward to that debate. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to the rule which will make in order the amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative TAYLOR.

The Taylor amendment seeks to allow HCFA to reimburse DOD for treatment in military medical facilities of military retirees and their dependents over the age of 65 who are Medicare eligible.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the proposed amendment to the rule at this point in the RECORD.

On page 2, line 15, of H. Res. 472, immediately after "waived," insert the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this rule, it shall be in order to consider an amendment to be offered by Representative Taylor of Mississippi or his designee, which

shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) or a demand for a division of the question, and shall be considered as read."

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I want to point out that 60 percent of the

legislation in this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

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

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance .....	H. Res. 6	Closed .....	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package .....	H. Res. 5	Closed .....	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates .....	H. Res. 38	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget .....	H. Res. 44	Restrictive .....	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling .....	H. Res. 43 (0)	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico .....	H. Res. 51	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve .....	H. Res. 52	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California .....	H. Res. 53	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto .....	H. Res. 55	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 61	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 60	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 63	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act .....	H. Res. 69	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants .....	H. Res. 79	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act .....	H. Res. 83	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas .....	N/A	Restrictive .....	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance .....	N/A	Closed .....	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed .....	H. Res. 88	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act .....	H. Res. 91	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority .....	H. Res. 92	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium .....	H. Res. 93	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment .....	H. Res. 96	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility .....	H. Res. 100	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act .....	H. Res. 101	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act .....	H. Res. 105	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 104	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act .....	H. Res. 109	Restrictive .....	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions .....	H. Res. 115	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits .....	H. Res. 116	Restrictive .....	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform .....	H. Res. 119	Restrictive .....	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act .....	H. Res. 125	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act .....	H. Res. 126	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 129	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension .....	H. Res. 130	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act .....	H. Res. 136	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization .....	H. Res. 139	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act .....	H. Res. 140	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act .....	H. Res. 144	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa .....	H. Res. 145	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility .....	H. Res. 146	Open .....	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution .....	H. Res. 149	Restrictive .....	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 155	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act; FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 164	Restrictive .....	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 167	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations .....	H. Res. 169	Restrictive .....	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations .....	H. Res. 170	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations .....	H. Res. 171	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag .....	H. Res. 173	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill .....	H. Res. 175	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations .....	H. Res. 177	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1977* Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations .....	H. Res. 185	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations .....	H. Res. 187	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations .....	H. Res. 188	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations .....	H. Res. 189	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations .....	H. Res. 190	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China .....	H. Res. 193	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations .....	H. Res. 194	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil .....	H. Res. 197	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations .....	H. Res. 198	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations .....	H. Res. 201	Open .....	N/A
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia .....	H. Res. 204	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations .....	H. Res. 205	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 207	Restrictive .....	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act .....	H. Res. 208	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments .....	H. Res. 215	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization .....	H. Res. 216	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box .....	H. Res. 218	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 219	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS) .....	H. Res. 222	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 224	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 225	Restrictive .....	2R/2D.
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 226	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions .....	H. Res. 227	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 228	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 230	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 234	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments .....	H. Res. 237	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act .....	H. Res. 238	Restrictive .....	1D.
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill .....	H. Res. 239	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform .....	H. Res. 245	Restrictive .....	1D.
H. Con. Res. 109	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 251	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 1833	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 252	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 2546	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 257	Closed .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit .....	H. Res. 258	Restrictive .....	5R.
H.R. 2586	ICC Termination .....	H. Res. 259	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 261	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt .....	H. Res. 262	Closed .....	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform .....	H. Res. 268	Closed .....	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 269	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment .....	H. Res. 273	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 289	Open .....	N/A

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

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1350 .....	Maritime Security Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 287	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2621 .....	To Protect Federal Trust Funds .....	H. Res. 293	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 1745 .....	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 303	Open .....	N/A
H. Res. 304 .....	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia. ....	N/A	Closed .....	1D: 2R
H. Res. 309 .....	Revised Budget Resolution .....	H. Res. 309	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 558 .....	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act ...	H. Res. 313	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2677 .....	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995. ....	H. Res. 323	Closed .....	N/A
PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION				
H.R. 1643 .....	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria. ....	H. Res. 334	Closed .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 134 .....	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134. ....	H. Res. 336	Closed .....	N/A
H. Res. 131 .....	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts. ....	H. Res. 338	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 2924 .....	Social Security Guarantee Act .....	H. Res. 355	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 2854 .....	The Agricultural Market Transition Program .....	H. Res. 366	Restrictive .....	5D: 9R: 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 994 .....	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 368	Open rule: Rule tabled .....	N/A
H.R. 3021 .....	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States. ....	H. Res. 371	Closed rule .....	N/A
H.R. 3019 .....	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget .....	H. Res. 372	Restrictive .....	2D/2R
H.R. 2703 .....	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 380	Restrictive .....	6D: 7R: 4 Bipartisan
H.R. 2202 .....	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 384	Restrictive .....	12D: 19R: 1 Bipartisan
H.J. Res. 165 .....	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 386	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 125 .....	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996. ....	H. Res. 388	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 3136 .....	The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 391	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 3103 .....	The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 392	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 159 .....	Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment .....	H. Res. 395	Restrictive .....	1D
H.R. 842 .....	Truth in Budgeting Act .....	H. Res. 396	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2715 .....	Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 409	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 1675 .....	National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 410	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 175 .....	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996 .....	H. Res. 411	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 2641 .....	United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 418	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2149 .....	The Ocean Shipping Reform Act .....	H. Res. 419	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2974 .....	To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims. ....	H. Res. 421	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3120 .....	To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering. ....	H. Res. 422	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 2406 .....	The United States Housing Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 426	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3322 .....	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 427	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3286 .....	The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996 .....	H. Res. 428	Restrictive .....	1D: 1R
H.R. 3230 .....	Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 430	Restrictive .....	41 amends: 20D: 17R: 4 bipartisan
H.R. 3415 .....	Repeal of the 4.3-Cent Increase in Transportation Fuel Taxes .....	H. Res. 436	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 3259 .....	Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 437	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 3144 .....	The Defend America Act .....	H. Res. 438	Restrictive .....	1D
H.R. 3448/H.R. 1227 .....	The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act of 1996. ....	H. Res. 440	Restrictive .....	2R
H.R. 3517 .....	Military Construction Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 442	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3540 .....	Foreign Operations Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 445	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3562 .....	The Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act .....	H. Res. 446	Restrictive .....	N/A
H.R. 2754 .....	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act .....	H. Res. 448	Restrictive .....	1R
H.R. 3603 .....	Agriculture Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 451	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3610 .....	Defense Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 453	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3662 .....	Interior Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 455	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3666 .....	VA/HUD Appropriations .....	H. Res. 456	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3675 .....	Transportation Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 460	Open .....	N/A
H.J. Res. 182/H. Res. 461 .....	Disapproving MFN Status for the Peoples Republic of China .....	H. Res. 463	Closed .....	N/A
H. Con. Res. 192 .....	Making in order a Concurrent Resolution Providing for the Adjournment of the House over the 4th of July district work period. ....	H. Res. 465	Closed .....	N/A
H.R. 3755 .....	Labor/HHS Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 472	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 3754 .....	Legislative Branch Appropriations FY 1997 .....	H. Res. 473	Restrictive .....	3D: 5R

\* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. \*\*\* All legislation 2d Session, 60% restrictive; 40% open. All legislation 104th Congress, 56% restrictive; 44% open. \*\*\*\*\* NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this body are going to have two chances to vote on Medicare subvention. Again, 270 Members, including the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is not here on the floor unfortunately, are sponsors of this measure. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]; the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE]; the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP]; and the ranking Democrats who serve on those

committees are cosponsors of this measure.

□ 1730

It is the right thing. They are the only people in America who were promised health care and the only people in America who are being denied the health care they deserve.

We have a chance to fix that. Two hundred fifty-seven Members of this body, including most recently 258, because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] has signed on, have said this is something that this Nation ought to do. It is a promise that ought to be kept.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the rule and make this in order. If it is not, then I am going to take the words of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mr. PRYCE], who is a cosponsor of this measure, to task and see if it is truly an open rule, and we will offer it as an

amendment so that the Members of this body will have the chance to do the right thing for our Nation's military retirees; to prove that we are putting right over procedure and we are going to keep our promises to the military retirees of this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], we had one member of the Committee on Rules come in unexpectedly. I would ask if I may deviate to recognize the gentlewoman from Utah, Ms. ENID GREENE. It will be a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. GREENE].

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. It is an open rule that will provide thorough consideration of the issues by allowing amendments to be offered on the floor.



Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we note that for too many years Washington has spent tax dollars and created bloated bureaucracies to show that we care. Nowhere is this more apparent than when we look at what Washington has done to our education system.

Today, we have 760 federally run education programs administered by a jumble of 39 separate Federal departments, agencies, boards, and commissions at a cost of \$120 billion to the American taxpayers.

But, Mr. Chairman, for all those programs and all that money, student academic performance in this country has not improved in the last 20 years. In fact, we have seen a steady decline in student performance as parents and local communities have less control over their children's educations.

SAT scores have dropped from a total average of 937 in 1972 to 902 in 1994; 66 percent of our 17-year-olds do not read at a proficient level; reading scores are down, science scores are down, and United States students score worse in math than all major countries except Spain.

Now, there is no doubt that many of these programs are well intentioned, but good intentions are not good enough when dealing with our children's education. Clearly, the Washington education bureaucracy simply has not accomplished what needs to be accomplished for our children and there may be no better example of how using spending as the chief or only measurement of creating educational excellence has failed this Nation and our children than my own State of Utah.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Utah ranks last in the 50 States in per-pupil spending in the Nation, yet it ranks second in the Nation in the number of high school graduates, first in the Nation for the number of residents who have attended college, and the scores of Utah students taking the ACT test in 1995 rose in every subject and were higher than the national ACT group in every area.

As the President said in his State of the Union Address, "The era of big government is over," and it is time to empower our State and local communities to pick up where Washington needs to jump off.

Let me stress, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not gut education programs. This bill freezes spending at last year's level for the title I program for disadvantaged students as well as for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. Spending for the Head Start Program is increased by \$31 million above the 1996 level, and Pell grants are increased to a maximum of \$2,500, up from \$2,470 just last year.

Mr. Speaker, with all the helping the Federal Government has been doing over the last 30 or 40 years, is it not time to explore other ways of giving our children the first-rate education they need and deserve?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no remaining speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all point out that already we seem to somehow get away from preciseness in the use of words. I heard "cuts in the Head Start Program." There are no cuts in the Head Start Program. As the charts will show and as the debate will show as we go into the 2 hours of general debate and the individual open rule amendments, I am sure we are going to see the charts are going to be displayed that in fact there are increases in programs like Head Start; good programs that deserve increases.

We have before us a situation where we have many programs that are nice to have, that are funded by the Federal Government. And we have many programs that are, I guess we should say that we need to have, that are funded by the Federal Government for people who have true serious needs and no other place to turn.

And I think it is important to try and make the distinctions between "nice to have," and "need to have" programs because sometimes we forget here that all of the moneys from these programs do not come from Washington, they come from us, the people, the taxpayers, from back home. And if we do a pretty good job of what we do back home and we do not have to send the money to Washington, it seems to me we are better off.

So I think when we talk about "need to have" programs, the taxpayers understand a little bit; and when we talk about "nice to have" programs, they are a little less willing to send their hard-earned dollars to Washington.

I would also point out that some of the people who are working the hardest for the "need to have" programs are the people who can least afford those tax dollars, and I would point out that this majority is trying to relieve them of some of their tax burdens as well.

What this boils down a little bit to is restraint. And I think that it is very important that we continue to exercise the restraint that we have started on in this Congress toward a balanced budget in the next 7 years. I am going to read just briefly from the administration's statement on this bill that they, apparently the senior advisors to the President, have threatened to veto. And I am going to take just one of the statements, this one has to do with the Department of Education and student loan programs and here is the statement I am quoting.

And it says, "As with the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bill, the administration continues to oppose any cap on direct lending."

Now, that is a debatable point, but it seems to me there is not much restraint if you are not going to oppose any cap on direct spending. That means the sky is the limit. How does this match up against other priorities

and other needs? Those are the kinds of concerns that I am very concerned about.

I go on through the administration's statement and there are five pages of the sky-is-going-to-fall type statements in here. Then we come to some of the issues that I think Americans need to know. This is the type of thing that the administration is saying. And again, I wonder how many parents in America are going to think this is money well spent.

I am quoting from the administration's statement that is saying that "by providing no funding for the \$30 million teen pregnancy prevention initiative, the committee would stall the development of critical knowledge about how to prevent teen pregnancy."

Now, I can tell you there is probably a bunch of teenagers running around out there that could tell me a thing or two about how to stop teen pregnancy right now. And I daresay that most of us understand how you get pregnant, whether you are a teenager or not. And I wonder whether or not the sky is really going to fall if we do not spend this \$30 million that the President's administration says we have got to spend.

I think it is very important that we have good, informed people about all the consequences of their actions, whatever their actions and behaviors may be. But I think to say that we are going to lose the world with teen pregnancy because we do not spend \$30 million on critical knowledge about how you get pregnant is stretching the point just a bit. And I would suggest that many American taxpayers are going to say that that is \$30 million that might be well spent in other programs that will be better used to prevent teen pregnancy.

I take a look at the total difference. It is about \$5.5 billion of what the President asked, which is virtually everything that was put on the plate, because the President is in the position of being the candy store proprietor in this budget process. He can come into the candy store and say, Look, help yourself we have all of these things. Somebody has to be responsible and say yes, there are all of these wonderful opportunities, but we have to pay for these things and somebody has to pay for them and that is of course the taxpayer, and besides if we consume too much candy, we will get a tummy ache or worse.

We are in a position right now of being the people who are the responsible party in the candy store and saying we have to exercise some restraint both for price and behavioral reasons about how we go about doing things, and that is what this 2 hours of general debate and these amendments are going to lead to: legitimate differences of opinion about what is nice to have and what is need to have in this area.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the proposal to defeat the rule, I think that would be a very shortsighted action at this point. We should

support the rule, and we should vote "yes" on the previous question for a very simple reason. We have an appropriations bill here that has got billions and billions of dollars that are necessary for many critical programs, as we have said.

I think that the gentleman from Mississippi has made a very eloquent statement about an amendment that he feels very strongly about, and I frankly think it is a good amendment and I wish it could have been made in order, but we have rules in the House and his amendment is not germane. And we all know it.

The gentleman's amendment was voted on in the Committee on Rules and it was voted down in the Committee on Rules because it is not germane. It is legislating on an appropriations bill. We do not legislate on an appropriations bill unless we follow a protocol. The protocol is well-known. The protocol is you have to get a letter of no objection from the authorizing committees, and we have suggested that to the gentleman from Mississippi. He has a remedy to take. And I would urge him to do it because I think he has a good piece of legislation, with a significant number of cosponsors, which will do well on its own merits properly brought forward to the House vehicle. This is not the proper vehicle, and he is asking us to violate our rules and protocol if we are going to try to defeat the previous question.

So I would say we should vote "yes" on the previous question, and we should vote "yes" on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time with in which a vote by electronic device, if ordered will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 202, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—218

Allard	Bass	Bono
Archer	Bateman	Brownback
Army	Beilenson	Bryant (TN)
Bachus	Bilbray	Bunn
Baker (CA)	Bilirakis	Bunning
Baker (LA)	Bliley	Burr
Ballenger	Blute	Burton
Barr	Boehlert	Buyer
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Callahan
Barton	Bonilla	Calvert

Camp	Hayworth	Paxon
Campbell	Heineman	Petri
Canady	Herger	Pombo
Castle	Hobson	Porter
Chabot	Hoekstra	Portman
Chambliss	Hoke	Pryce
Chenoweth	Horn	Quillen
Christensen	Hostettler	Quinn
Chrysler	Houghton	Radanovich
Clinger	Hunter	Ramstad
Coble	Hutchinson	Regula
Coburn	Hyde	Riggs
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Roberts
Combest	Istook	Rogers
Cooley	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Crane	Kasich	Roth
Crapo	Kelly	Roukema
Creameans	Kim	Royce
Cubin	King	Salmon
Cunningham	Kingston	Sanford
Davis	Klug	Saxton
Deal	Knollenberg	Scarborough
DeLay	Kolbe	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Schiff
Dickey	Largent	Seastrand
Doollittle	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Dornan	LaTourette	Shadegg
Dreier	Laughlin	Shaw
Ehlers	Lazio	Shays
Ehrlich	Leach	Shuster
English	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
Ewing	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Fawell	Linder	Smith (TX)
Fields (TX)	Livingston	Solomon
Flanagan	LoBiondo	Souder
Foley	Lucas	Spence
Forbes	Manzullo	Stearns
Fowler	Martini	Stockman
Fox	McCollum	Stump
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Talent
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Tauzin
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Frisa	McIntosh	Thomas
Galleghy	McKeon	Thornberry
Ganske	Metcalf	Tiahrt
Gekas	Meyers	Upton
Gilchrest	Mica	Vucanovich
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Walker
Gilman	Molinar	Walsh
Goodlatte	Moorhead	Watts (OK)
Goodling	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Myers	Weldon (PA)
Graham	Myrick	Weller
Greene (UT)	Nethercutt	White
Greenwood	Neumann	Whitfield
Gunderson	Ney	Wicker
Gutknecht	Norwood	Wolf
Hancock	Nussle	Young (AK)
Hansen	Oxley	Zeliff
Hastert	Packard	Zimmer
Hastings (WA)	Parker	

NAYS—202

Abercrombie	Costello	Gejdenson
Ackerman	Coyne	Gephardt
Andrews	Cramer	Geren
Baessler	Cummings	Gonzalez
Baldacci	Danner	Gordon
Barcia	de la Garza	Green (TX)
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Becerra	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Bentsen	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Bereuter	Deutsch	Hamilton
Berman	Dicks	Harman
Bevill	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Bishop	Dixon	Hefley
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hefner
Bonior	Dooley	Hilleary
Borski	Doyle	Hilliard
Boucher	Duncan	Hinchey
Brewster	Durbin	Holden
Browder	Edwards	Hoyer
Brown (CA)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Brown (FL)	Ensign	Jackson-Lee
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	(TX)
Bryant (TX)	Evans	Jacobs
Cardin	Farr	Jefferson
Chapman	Fattah	Johnson (SD)
Clay	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Clayton	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Clement	Filner	Jones
Clyburn	Flake	Kanjorski
Coleman	Foglietta	Kaptur
Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MA)
Collins (MI)	Frost	Kennedy (RI)
Condit	Funderburk	Kennelly
Conyers	Furse	Kildee

Klecza	Neal	Skaggs
Klink	Oberstar	Skelton
LaFalce	Obey	Slaughter
Levin	Olver	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Spratt
Lipinski	Orton	Stenholm
Lofgren	Owens	Stokes
Lowey	Pallone	Studds
Luther	Pastor	Stupak
Maloney	Payne (NJ)	Tanner
Manton	Payne (VA)	Tate
Markey	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Martinez	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
Mascara	Peterson (MN)	Thompson
Matsui	Pickett	Thornnton
McCarthy	Pomeroy	Thurman
McDermott	Poshard	Torkildsen
McHale	Rahall	Torres
McKinney	Rangel	Torricelli
McNulty	Reed	Towns
Meehan	Richardson	Trafficant
Meek	Rivers	Velazquez
Menendez	Roemer	Vento
Millender	Rose	Visclosky
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Miller (CA)	Rush	Wamp
Minge	Sabo	Ward
Mink	Sanders	Waters
Moakley	Sawyer	Waxman
Mollohan	Schroeder	Williams
Montgomery	Schumer	Wilson
Moran	Scott	Wise
Murtha	Serrano	Woolsey
Nadler	Sisisky	Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett	Lantos	Watt (NC)
Dunn	Lincoln	Yates
Ford	Longley	Young (FL)
Gibbons	McDade	
Hayes	Stark	

□ 1803

Messrs. OWENS, RANGEL, HILLEARY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. TATE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. WATTS of Oklahoma, HERGER, SOLOMON, SMITH of Texas, RIGGS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Messrs. MCINTOSH, SMITH of New Jersey, DORNAN, SAXTON, SCARBOROUGH, MOORHEAD, and BEILENSEN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

□ 1805

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. 3755) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER 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 Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply for the purpose of explaining to Members what the schedule will be for the remainder of this evening.

The vote that was just taken is the last recorded vote, as I understand it. We will have the 2 hours of debate on the bill according to the rule, 1 hour on each side, and we will then proceed to amendments under title I, the Department of Labor, and will complete that title this evening with votes, if any, to be rolled over to tomorrow, and we will designate title II also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for 1 hour.

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

□ 1815

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by first thanking the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations for the extremely helpful role he has played in working the bill through the subcommittee mark and the full committee. Obviously he has, I think, one of the toughest of all jobs in the House. He does it splendidly, and we are all greatly in his debt.

I also want to thank each of the members of my subcommittee who worked so hard, especially the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, for his contribution to the bill, and for all of their participation in the very difficult process that we have gone through in marking up and reporting the bill. It has not been easy for any of us.

Finally I want to thank our staff. The staff of the full Committee on Appropriations have been extremely helpful to all of us. We hope to have all of the bills, including this bill, out by the time we enter the August break. This will be an accomplishment that is a testimony to the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and to the very, very fine work on a very experienced and expert staff, and all of us thank them very much.

I also want to thank my staff, Tony McCann, the Clerk, Bob Knisely, Sue Quantius, Mike Myers, Joanne Orndorff, and Lauren James. Lauren is on detail to the committee from the Department of Education, and she has been invaluable to our subcommittee all year long.

I also want to thank Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith of the minority staff for their excellent cooperation and the courtesy that they have extended to each one of us.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes a recommendation of \$65.7 billion for the

discretionary accounts within our jurisdiction. This level is within our 602(b) allocation and is about on the same level as the level for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, the bill sets priorities. It terminates funding for 39 programs funded last year at just over \$1 billion. These programs are characterized, with few exceptions, as being small, expensive to operate, and in most cases having little evidence of effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, at NIH we have taken the position that funding should be allocated according to the judgment of science as to where the best opportunities lie, and not according to the political fiat of Congress. We also have continued our effort to avoid earmarks in the bill. In NIH once again we removed all disease-specific earmarks and provided no specific AIDS earmarks. The distribution for AIDS funding as determined by NIH is at \$1.498 billion across all institutes and divisions of the agency. This is a determination, again, made by science and not by politics.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here listening to the debate on the rule and listening to the people on the minority side talk about all of the terrible things that are happening to education and job training. Mr. Chairman, I want people to understand exactly what they are talking about. The subcommittee's allocation is about level with last year, and most provisions of the bill are level-funded. There are no huge cuts anywhere in education.

When the minority discusses cuts, they mean cuts from the level of funding recommended by the President in his budget. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that the President's budget was a purely political document giving huge increases, that could not be afforded, to every interest group in America. The President took no responsibility for getting our fiscal house in order. We have to take that responsibility and we take it seriously. We have carried out our responsibility in this bill.

Let me talk about what we have done on the increase side. Job Corps operations is a program aimed to help the most at-risk youth in our society. It removes them from their current environment to one where they can get real job training, a chance for a working life and career in our society. Job Corps is increased by \$92 million.

The subcommittee added \$54 million for the Ryan White AIDS Program. Again, the committee has attempted to protect and support programs that impact the most vulnerable of our citizens. These are important dollars to be spent for people suffering from a very, very horrible disease, and we have provided an increase for Ryan White.

Summer youth is level-funded at \$625. I heard the gentlewoman from Texas saying what big cuts there were in the program. There are no cuts. It is level-funded.

An additional \$8 million is provided for the Violence Against Women Act. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter

of this program, which provides support and protection for battered women, rape victims, and victims of other forms of violence. We have provided an increase for this series of programs.

The bill provides \$900 million in new funding for the Low-Income Heating and Energy Assistance program, and with other emergency funding and funding that was available from previous appropriations, a total of \$1.32 billion is available for the LIHEAP program.

NIH research is increased by 6.5 percent.

The preventive health, maternal and child health, social services, and child care block grants are all increased, consistent with the subcommittee's policy of increasing funding for programs that increase local discretion. Again, these programs cannot be seen in isolation from the individuals they serve: poor women, young children, and the most vulnerable in our society—all which have a high priority in the bill.

The community services block grant, which is an extremely flexible program that can support many social services programs, including nutrition, energy assistance, employment, and crisis services, is increased by \$100 million, from approximately \$390 to \$490 million.

Innovative education program strategies is more than doubled, to \$609 million, by terminating several categorical programs to increase funding for this broad block grant.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the premier agency in the world in the search for the causes and treatment of a broad range of diseases, is increased by \$75 million, to \$2.2 billion; \$82 million dollars is provided for infectious disease control, \$135 million is provided for breast and cervical cancer screening, and other health promotion and disease prevention programs are also increased.

Mr. Chairman, health professions training funding is increased by \$34 million. Family planning is maintained at last year's level of \$192 million; \$802 million is provided for community and migrant health centers, and other health service programs are increased as well. Again, Mr. Chairman, these are programs that serve the poor, the disadvantaged, and the most vulnerable in our society and they are given high priority in our bill.

Head Start funding is increased to \$3.6 billion. Again, this is a program aimed directly at the poorest, most vulnerable children, and while not without its faults in some of its applications, is a high priority in this bill. TRIO is increased by \$37 million, an 8 percent increase. Pell grants, and I heard the gentlewoman say we were cutting Pell grants, the gentlewoman from Connecticut earlier, Pell grants maximums are again increased, this year by \$30, to \$2,500. Federal work-study grants are up over 10 percent, to \$685 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is here that I have the greatest difficulty of understanding the criticisms of my friends across the aisle. We have increased these student financial aid programs this year, and many of them were increased or frozen last year, yet there is still the drum-beat that the majority is cutting post-secondary education. We are not. Funds for college education, post-secondary education, are increasing.

The bill also continues our efforts at reform. As I mentioned, the bill terminates 39 mostly small, ineffective programs. Goals 2000, however, is also terminated. The bill consolidates the Eisenhower Professional Development Program with the innovative State grant program that will allow the States and localities to spend Federal education funding as they see fit, to meet locally defined needs and programs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the bill continues many of the legislative provisions that were included in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations and Rescissions Act of 1996. Among those included are provisions prohibiting the issuance of regulations by the NLRB related to single-site bargaining, provisions that have been carried in the bill for several years prohibiting the use of funds for abortions—the current Hyde language—provisions that limit the use of funds for the creation of human embryos for research and the use of embryos in research.

In addition, the subcommittee included several additional legislative provisions. Language is included strengthening the current language regarding OSHA ergonomic standards. The recommended language would prohibit the development or issuance of standards or guidelines and the collection of data with respect to repetitive motion injuries. Language is also included that would raise the minimum jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. The increase would return the minimum jurisdiction to the inflation-adjusted level it originally was set at in 1950. Finally, Mr. Chairman, language is included that prohibits the use of CDC funds for the advocacy of gun control.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to hear a great deal of discussion from our friends on the other side of the aisle on their belief, and the President's, that we need to spend more money on these and other programs. In the end, however, we are going to have to be responsible. In the end, every dollar we spend above current amounts in the bill are borrowed and must be repaid by our children, who have, after all, no vote and whose futures we are mortgaging if we spend beyond our means.

This is a responsible bill, Mr. Chairman. It reflects the priorities for education and health and job training and the protection of the most vulnerable in our society, and I commend it to the Members. I believe it is a fair, responsible bill and does the job for the American people.

I would like to clarify the intent of language included in the section of House Report 104-659 relating to the buildings and facilities account within the National Institutes of Health. The report indicates that the committee expects that the detailed construction documents for the clinical center be reviewed by an outside party acceptable to both NIH and Congress. This outside party could be a single entity or a panel of experts drawn from various institutions. Such a review would take place at the design development stage of the project. The review should focus on a thorough examination of program and cost estimates, but need not involve review of detailed construction documents.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, I think, defines in a major way the differences in priorities between the two political parties in this House. For years we have had a decline in the school-age population in this country. It has been going down for a number of years. But the fact is that we are now experiencing a steady increase in school enrollment in this country, and, in fact, next year there will be more students enrolled in local school districts than at any time in the country's history.

We would simply ask the question on this side of the aisle: Why should we be cutting per pupil expenditures for those students at a time when we are experiencing an increase in student enrollment?

If we take a look at what is happening to per pupil expenditures and look at it in real dollar terms, we will see that per pupil expenditures at the Federal level are declining from \$287 per student to \$222 by the end of the sixth year of the Republican budget which just went through this House several months ago, and this bill is the first year's step in that budget process.

Last year the Republican majority in this House tried to cut \$7 billion out of this bill. The public rebelled. After the public rebelled at those reductions last year, we were able, in conference with the Senate, to restore about 90 percent of the education cuts which had been made by House Republicans in this bill last year.

This year's bill has a more stealthy plan to make those same reductions. On the surface, it appears to be pretty much a stand-pat budget but, in reality, there is a \$500 million reduction in Department of Education programs, and over the next 6 years, we would wind up with a reduction of some \$35 billion below current services, and we would wind up with cuts of about \$57 billion below the President's requests.

□ 1830

That is a 20 percent cut in real deliverable program levels by 2002. We simply on this side of the aisle do not think that that is in the interest of the

country. We do not think that that will help the economy grow. We believe that these reductions come at the worst possible time for local schools. Schools face sharp competition for resources from State and local sources. This budget squeeze at the State and local level comes at the same time that Federal education aid dollars are declining in real terms while school enrollment, as I just indicated, is rising. That creates a double-jeopardy situation which we think is unhealthy.

This bill begins the process under which this year up to 15,000 Head Start kids will be squeezed out of the program under this bill. Over 150,000 title I children will lose title I services that help them to read and to master science and math. The President's budget would have supported nearly 450,000 additional title I students. By the end of the Republican 6-year budget plan, more than 1 million kids will not be receiving the reading and math help they need under the title I program. Under Goals 2000, which is the program that was begun under President Bush, supported by then Governor Clinton, under that Goals 2000 program which would help 8,500 local schools raise math and science standards so that kids can compete globally, that program would be terminated in this bill. That results in 2 billion fewer dollars provided for school improvement between now and 2002. Nearly 340,000 math and science teachers will lose the training that they need to upgrade their skills because the bill eliminates the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program. Over 300,000 students will lose vocational education and training opportunities in just this year alone under the bill. There will be 14,000 kids who lose bilingual education opportunities. Two hundred twenty thousands students who receive Perkins loans and grants under the State-assisted student incentive program will no longer be able to get the help they need to attend college. There are 107,000 fewer college kids who will receive Pell grant programs compared to the President's budget. Seventy-nine thousand fewer summer youth jobs will be provided under this proposal. Dislocated worker assistance will be provided to 32,000 fewer workers than last year.

This is the bill that is supposed to help children and workers get ahead in life. Yet this bill puts us on the road to a systematic disinvestment in education and puts roadblocks in the way of those workers and those children.

I would point out that there has been a lot of talk through the past years about how sound Social Security and Medicare will be in the next century. Raising the wages and the earning power of the American workforce is crucial to being able to strengthen those funds, because you need to strengthen the income people have so that they can increase their payments into those funds. This is the bill that most directly impacts our obligation to give kids from working families a

chance to make something of themselves and it is being short-sheeted in my view.

In addition to the education problem, we have added over 2 million seniors in the last 5 years to our population. Yet this bill continues the downward trend of the 1996 Appropriation Act by again cutting funds for the Administration on Aging.

For worker protection, the House bill cuts worker protection programs by 13 percent below the President's request and 9 percent below what is needed to simply maintain last year's level of operations. That means cuts in our ability to help guarantee workplace health and safety, pension protection, and immigration reform.

The bill also cuts funding for the NLRB by 15 percent below last year's level and 20 percent below the President's request. We do not think that is wise. In addition, it contains a number of riders which we do not believe make much sense.

Low Income Heating Assistance Program, a program which I started with Senator Muskie a long time ago, that Low Income Energy Assistance Program is crucial to help seniors and vulnerable individuals pay their home heating bills. I come from a part of the country where you get 40 below zero weather, and I am not talking about chill factor, I am talking about real term temperature cold. In 1996 the Low Income Heating Assistance Program was slashed by \$419 million. This bill provides \$100 million less than the President requested and it appropriates not one dime for fiscal 1998 for that program.

I would simply point out that from 1981 to 1994, the low-income population eligible for LIHEAP has grown by 10 million people. Yet the percentage of eligible households served by it has dropped from 36 to 21 percent and the percentage of assistance on their fuel bills which people get from the Federal Government has declined from 23 percent to 12 percent in 1994 and it will go down even more.

So for this and a variety of reasons, I would simply say that we on the minority side feel that this bill is not adequate to the challenge facing the country and I regretfully intend to vote "no" when the bill reaches its final passage stage.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, as a former fourth grade school teacher and the mother of two, I understand the importance of education to the health and vitality of our Nation. We who are in positions of authority have a solemn responsibility to formulate policies that will provide all children with access to quality education.

Mr. Chairman, 66 percent of 17-year-olds do not read at a proficient level, and 30 percent of all children entering

college have to take remedial education classes. These sorry statistics are the unfortunate result of several factors, the most important of which is the unrestrained growth of the Federal education bureaucracy.

Only about 6 percent of all education spending in the United States comes from Federal sources, yet one study found that it accounted for over 50 percent of all the paperwork for local school districts. We need more teachers, we need better teachers in the classrooms with the students, not more bureaucrats buried under mountains of paper.

This Congress has trimmed the fat from the education budget but it has not cut vital and effective programs. Both Pell grants and the work-study program reach an all-time high under the Republican budget this year. These programs are proven successes and should be preserved.

Yet out of a Federal education monolith consisting of 760 programs and costing \$120 billion a year, there is much that must be reformed. Of these programs, only 3.6 percent are science-related, only 1.8 percent are reading-related, and only 1.1 percent are math-related. Mr. Chairman, our limited Federal resources are being squandered.

Washington, DC is not the place to look for education policy. We need to look at the local school districts, the teachers, the parents, the local committees, and families that must be allowed to educate children without interference from the Federal bureaucracy.

What works for New York State may not work for the children of the central coast of California, where I come from. I say, give those who know education best the ability to make policy that works for the folks at home, for their own communities, their own children. We in Washington, DC should offer support but get out of the way. Our children deserve better.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to make an observation with respect to what is happening in the Congress and in the United States of America regarding how we spend our money and how we make decisions on spending our money.

The chart to my right shows that in 1962, 70 percent of the Federal budget was so-called discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is decisions that we make about where we want to invest our money to make our country stronger and more viable as a Nation, to make people more secure and more able to compete. That has now dropped down to less than 36 percent.

Half of that is for our national defense. I am one of those Democrats that supports the national defense, and I have done so since 1981 when I first came here. We added \$12 billion to defense this year when it passed this

House. Why did we do so? We did so on the premise that to freeze defense was in fact a cut. In fact, I think that rationale was correct. But I am not so sure why that rationale does not apply to the defense of this Nation as it relates to the education of our children and the security of our families.

In 1983, the Department of Education issued a report. It was a stark and compelling report, and it was entitled "A Nation At Risk."

What did it say? I am quoting from that report, issued under the imprimatur of Secretary Terrence Bell, who recently passed away. He was a fine Secretary of Education, a member of the Reagan Cabinet. The report said this:

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have dismantled essential support systems which helped make these gains possible. We have in effect been committing an act of unthinking unilateral educational disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I will oppose this bill because it sounds retreat, and America ought not to retreat. In a time when we need to have families first in our focus, at a time when we need to strengthen education and strengthen children, sounding the bugle of retreat is not a proper policy.

We will have a very substantial increase in the numbers of children going to our schools over the next 6 years. Next year, in fact, we will have more children in school than in any year in our history.

What does that mean? That means there will be a greater burden on local and State governments. As the previous speaker said, the Federal Government contributes only 6 percent of the educational resources available to our families and to educate our children. But that 6 percent is a critical part. In fact, it is the part which deals with some of the most vulnerable children in America, those who have economic, cultural, and educational deprivations in their families, and who therefore start out behind the others with whom they will go to school.

This chart shows that we are going to have 3.4 million more children entering school from 1997 to 2002. It also shows that the Republican budget's freeze at \$14.4 billion for elementary and secondary education is essentially a retreat, because it will effectively be, in 2002, \$12 billion in real dollars, in resources available. In an atmosphere where the need is growing, our investment is decreasing.

□ 1845

That does not make sense for our families or for our children. I said that the numbers of children were increasing, and I showed Members on the chart where the budget goes from \$14.4 billion to approximately \$12 billion in real terms by 2002. Now, that is when we will be experiencing an addition of 3.4 million new young people in our school system.

Those children do not disappear. Those children will not have another chance at being 3 or 4 or 5 years old. This is not something that we can catch up on tomorrow, when perhaps, as George Bush says, our wallet will match our will. I believe that we ought to have the will, and I clearly believe we have the wallet. As a matter of fact, as a Democrat for a balanced budget, I voted for the coalition budget. The coalition budget, in fact, balanced the budget, cut more spending than the Republican or the President's alternative, and provided an additional \$47 billion for education. How did it do that? Because we did not pretend that we could cut taxes, balance the budget, and make sure that families were secure in the knowledge that their children would receive the kinds of education that they need.

Under the President's budget, there would have been \$7.05 billion for title I. Title I is for economically deprived children who need some additional help to be competitive, so that they can join our workforce in competing with an increasingly able workforce around the world. A freeze in real terms would serve 6.8 million children in 2002. The chairman suggests a freeze in 1997 but in point of fact, that policy will result in an actual decrease to 5.8 million children who will be served in 2002. This is opposed to the President's budget, which will serve 6.8 million children. That is 1 million American children that will have no seats for title I assistance in the schools of our Nation because of this Republican budget. I believe that policy is inconsistent with our desire to compete in the global marketplace, with our desire to pledge to families that they can be secure in the knowledge that their children will have the kind of education, Head Start, and title I assistance that they need.

Now, I want to tell my friends in the House that my children have had great advantages. Their father and their mother earn substantial incomes. Their father and their mother had the advantages of higher education. But let me tell Members something that all of us, I am sure, know, and that every family in America knows: Our children will be affected by the ability to participate and contribute of every other child in their generation. Therefore, I say to my friends that this budget, which calls us to retreat, is a budget we ought to reject.

I talked about title I. Today in America, in a program that President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton supported and funded, we serve 53 percent of the children who are eligible. That means we do not serve 47 percent. I think that is a problem. I think what we ought to do is increase the percentage that we serve. Why? Because it makes us more competitive and makes us a more viable society.

But this Republican budget, as I said, sounds retreat and moves from 53 percent of children served today by title I

to 42 percent of the children served in 2002. That extrapolates into those 1 million children that I told Members about. Those are real children from real families in a country that, increasingly in a global marketplace, knows that it has got to have better skills for its children.

This next chart shows in very specific terms what will happen in the cities and towns of America. Let me give some examples. In Dallas, TX, a freeze in title I as proposed by the chairman will mean 29 teachers lose their jobs and 726 students lose help next year. S. 726 students next year in Dallas, TX, as a result of this bill will not get the kind of help that they need. The Miami-Dade area will lose 40 teachers and 1,011 students next year. It will lose 255 teachers and 6,386 students over the next 5 years.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, in order to stay even, just this year, we would have to add \$2.6 billion to this bill for education.

Now, recall with me my opening statement that we added \$12 billion to the defense bill so that we could stay even and remain the strongest Nation on the face of the earth. My Republican colleagues pointed out that if we did not have that additional \$12 billion, if we froze funding at last year's level, that we would in fact be putting at risk the Nation by underfunding our defense. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, let us not underfund the defense of America by underfunding the children, the education of America. I urge a "no" vote on this appropriation bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a very able member of our subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker tried to scare us about what is happening in education, and I just want to set the record straight. First of all, the Federal Government only pays 5 percent of the total amount of money in elementary and secondary education. Ninety-five percent of the money comes from State and local governments, and that is where the responsibility belongs, with the family and State and local governments.

He talks about title I. Where are the cuts? Title I has increased 40 percent in the last 7 years, and it is flat funded for this year. There is no cut. The amount of money going for title I stays at \$6.7 billion.

I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to talk about something other than the area of education right now, and I want to talk about something that is very, very important, and that is the area of biomedical research.

Biomedical research is a fundamental priority that can dramatically improve and change the lives of individual Americans. Therefore, for the second year in a row, we have significantly increased funding at the National Institutes for Health and for the Centers for Disease Control. Another reason, by

the way, I am supporting this bill very strongly is we want to eliminate wasteful and duplicative spending programs, and this bill eliminates 39 programs in addition to the 109 programs we eliminated last year. So I support this program because what it is, we set Federal priorities. We take a hard look at those functions of the Federal Government and decide what they can do and the responsibility of the Federal Government should do. We identify those crucial programs and increase the funding for those that are the most important, and we decrease funding for wasteful or nonessential bureaucracy.

The National Institutes for Health is a perfect example since it represents a true Federal responsibility. By providing over a 6-percent increase, we are continuing our commitment to ensure the health and welfare of our citizens. Under the leadership of Chairman PORTER, we have committed to building a new clinical research center, and this had broad bipartisan support.

The Human Genome Project, which is literally mapping the entire human DNA, is moving forward ahead of schedule. Funding for AIDS research is once again increased. We have seen hopeful breakthroughs at NIH for the treatment of this disease, and the Republican plan continues to provide the resources needed to find a treatment and cure.

We should support the National Institutes for Health because it is truly one of the great institutions of the entire world. Dozens and dozens of Americans have been awarded the Nobel Prize with help from NIH research grants. Some of the most important medical discoveries of the 20th century have occurred at the NIH campus or through NIH grants to the Universities in this country.

America has created the finest medical research facility in the world, and this bill ensures that it will remain a true force for the improvement of our health and well-being as a society.

Another great institution is the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. It reaches across the entire country and entire globe. This bill increases funding for several CDC prevention programs. We increase funding for breast and cervical cancer screening, chronic and environmental disease prevention, infectious disease, AIDS education and prevention, lead poisoning prevention, and the preventive health services block grant. CDC is an example of an activity the Federal Government is uniquely qualified to accomplish. We have increased funding in 1996 and again in 1997.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LIVINGSTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3396, DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-666) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3755 and include extraneous and tabular material and charts.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 39½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the Members to the charts beside me. First, a chart depicting the expenditures of the

U.S. Government in 1962, Jack Kennedy's heyday, when the Federal Government in that fiscal year spent \$106.8 billion with a very minor deficit. The deficit today runs around \$150 billion.

It was a different day, a different era. Half of that was defense, which is depicted in the lower yellow portion of the pie, and roughly one-sixth of the budget, a little bit more than one-sixth, is the nondefense discretionary portion, which includes the programs funded in this bill.

□ 1900

The blue portion refers to the entitlements, which at that time consisted of Social Security and welfare and various other mandatory spending programs. The red is interest on the debt, which then was a "big" \$7 billion.

Times have changed, Mr. Chairman. Today—for fiscal 1997—the chart looks entirely different. More than half is blue, the mandatory portion of the budget, which is now Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, welfare and other mandatory programs. The total amount now that we propose to spend is \$1.6 trillion compared to \$106 billion in fiscal 1962.

Today we spend 15 times more than we spent back in Jack Kennedy's day. As I say, half of it is for mandatory spending. We raise most of the money, and we transfer it to other people. We tax the American people and pass it on to the next guy.

The discretionary portion looks entirely different. Before, half of the whole budget was defense; now it is only one-sixth. But the other sixth, or the other half of the third, represents discretionary spending which is now about \$269 billion, and a good portion of what is in this bill makes up that amount.

Actually some of what is in this bill is also funded in the blue, or the mandatory portion, but what is significant about this chart is the red. The significant of the red on this chart is the fact that it has grown disproportionate to the entire pie, which itself has grown by 15 times since 1962. The red represents the interest on the debt.

Within the next year or so the red, the interest that we pay on the debt, the borrowing of \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion a year over the last many years, is now rapidly approaching the same amount of money and soon will, exceed what we spend on the defense of this Nation, our first priority under the Constitution of the United States.

So I have heard various Members from the other side of the aisle troop down here and say we have to take care of the little children, the infirm, the elderly, we have to take care of the disabled and people who cannot help themselves, and my answer is if we do not get a handle on this problem, all of those people along with every one of us is in deep trouble.

The interest on the debt is the first thing the Government must pay. Oth-

erwise we default. If we do not want to default, we have to pay the interest on the debt even before we worry about the security of our Nation and of every man woman and child in this Nation.

If we do not get that interest on the debt under control, if we do not get this borrowing in control, that tendency that has caused us to borrow up to \$100, \$200, to \$300 billion a year, because we are spending that much more than we receive every single year with the exception of perhaps 3 years since World War II, frankly, the red color on the chart will encompass everything else, and we will not be able to afford anything else.

So I would say take care of the little children first by balancing our books. Now, the other side will say, well, we are balancing them on the backs of the children. I say that is not true. The fact is we are making significant savings. In fiscal year 1995 we saved a net of \$16 billion, in fiscal year 1996 a net of an additional \$20 billion. In fiscal year 1997, which we are in now, it will be another 15 to \$20 billion. Minimum, a net savings to the American taxpayer of \$53 billion under what was appropriated by the Democrats when they had control last in the Congress.

If we look at President Clinton's budget compared to where he would take us had he had a Democratic Congress, we are saving around \$80 billion, all of that out of the discretionary spending. That savings is achieved by cutting everything fairly and equitably.

Is it out of education? No. First of all, the Federal Government only spends roughly 5 percent of the entire education budget. This is the chart showing what the United States spends on education. State and local governments spend 95 percent; the Federal Government puts up an additional 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that despite the fact that we have heard this hue and cry about cutting the people that are least able, total nondefense discretionary spending is going up. The fact is, yes, we are eliminating duplicative programs. We have cut unnecessary programs. We have already eliminated a number of programs; gone from 655 in 1995, to 515 in 1996, and to 464 in 1997, in this bill.

At the same time the savings generated by these eliminations are, in fact, going to the States in the form of block grants, block grants for States and localities to spend the money as they please. Community service block grants has gone up from \$390 to \$490 million. For child care and development programs, it has gone up from \$935 to \$950 million. For social services block grant, it has gone up from \$2.4 to \$2.5 billion. And for maternal and child block grants, it has gone up by \$3 million from \$678 to \$681 million. We are spending more, not less, on block grants.

Student aid is going up. The student aid has increased. Maximum Pell