

POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTER DISABILITY
RETIREMENTS

SEC. 143. (a) Up to 50 police officers and up to 50 Fire and Emergency Medical Services members with less than 20 years of departmental service who were hired before February 14, 1980, and who retire on disability before the end of calendar year 1997 shall be excluded from the computation of the rate of disability retirements under subsection 145(a) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979 (93 Stat. 882; D.C. Code, sec. 1-725(a)), for purposes of reducing the authorized Federal payment to the District of Columbia Police Officers and Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund pursuant to subsection 145(c) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979.

(b) The Mayor, within 30 days after the enactment of this provision, shall engage an enrolled actuary, to be paid by the District of Columbia Retirement Board, and shall comply with the requirements of section 142(d) and section 144(d) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-122, approved November 17, 1979; D.C. Code, secs. 1-722(d) and 1-724(d)).

(c) This section shall not go into effect until 15 days after the Mayor transmits the actuarial report required by section 142(d) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-122, approved November 17, 1979) to the District of Columbia Retirement Board, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

SEC. 144. (a) Section 451(c)(3) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 803; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1130(c)(3)), is amended by striking the word "section" and inserting the word "subsection" in its place.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL REFORM

SEC. 145. Section 2204(c)(2) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-134) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) TUITION, FEES, AND PAYMENTS.—

"(A) PROHIBITION.—A public charter school may not, with respect to any student other than a nonresident student, charge tuition, impose fees, or otherwise require payment for participation in any program, educational offering, or activity that—

"(i) enrolls students in any grade from kindergarten through grade 12; or

"(ii) is funded in whole or part through an annual local appropriation.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—A public charter school may impose fees or otherwise require payment, at rates established by the Board of Trustees of the school, for any program, educational offering, or activity not described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A), including adult education programs, or for field trips or similar activities."

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 52, line 23, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 52, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 146. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products to the greatest extent practicable.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each agency of the Federal or District of Columbia government shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment that has been offered to all the appropriation bills, and I am going to thank all the appropriators for, over the years, including this language into the bills. I think it encourages people to whenever possible in utilizing the scarce procurement dollars of the U.S. Government, to attempt to buy wherever possible American-made products.

In addition, anybody who would, in fact, place a false, fraudulent made-in-America label on any product that is sold to our Government through any of these contracted agreements would be prohibited from bidding on further contracts.

So I appreciate the fact the appropriators have included this language. It is that standard language that has been on other appropriation bills.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for yielding. We have examined the amendment, Mr. Chairman, find it to be in perfectly good order, find it to be consistent with the wishes of the subcommittee, and have no objections to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the subcommittee Chair.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection to this amendment. It is a good amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, with that I hope wherever possible when we expend U.S. taxpayer dollars it is on American-made products from American workers who pay our taxes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1997.

Mr. WALSH. 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. WALSH) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 3845), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1731

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT] at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 18, 1996, 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. 3845.

□ 1732

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. 3845) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICENT] had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 52, line 25.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT: Page 52, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 146. The amount otherwise provided under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia" for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, is hereby reduced by 1.9 percent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the next installment of the amendments that I have been offering to all of the appropriation bills since the House passed the joint budget conference committee report, and as my colleagues will probably recall, under that report this House for the first time in the last 4 years is actually going to allow the deficit of the United States to go up in the next fiscal year, and many of us who were upset upon learning that went back to our offices and tried to figure out what it was that perhaps we could do on a constructive basis to recover that fumble. And what we came up with was the notion that if we offered a 1.9 percent across-the-board reduction on the balance of the appropriation bills that were still out there, we could recover \$4.1 billion in additional Federal spending.

So I offer this amendment in good faith even though I serve in the District of Columbia Oversight Subcommittee, and I appreciate the work that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and his subcommittee

have done in terms of controlling the level of spending and trying to get the fiscal house in order not only for the District of Columbia, but for all of the taxpayers of the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think, in fairness, if we are going to offer this to one appropriation bill, we have to offer it to all of them. This amendment that I am offering today affects the \$660 million that goes to the District of Columbia in the way of a Federal payment. It does not affect the Federal contributions to employees' retirement accounts, it does not affect the rest of the \$5 billion which flows through the District of Columbia general fund, and it does not unfairly pick on the District of Columbia.

We have offered this same amendment to all appropriation bills since the approval of the joint budget resolution conference committee report. We are asking the District of Columbia government to make the same kind of sacrifice that we have asked the rest of the Federal Government to make, a simple 1.9 percent reduction.

As I said earlier, I serve on the District of Columbia Subcommittee, I appreciate the work that that District of Columbia Subcommittee has done, and I appreciate the work that the financial oversight board has been doing to try and put the District of Columbia back on a financial path toward solvency. But I believe that if we are going to be fair and if we are going to be honest and if we are going to be consistent in what we do around here, I have to offer this amendment in good faith.

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

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. While I know it is with the best of intentions, looking toward reducing our deficit by reducing our Federal spending, I want to assure him that we have made every effort to do so, in fact, have been accused of asking for too many spending cuts of the District of Columbia.

The Federal payment to the District of Columbia is a contribution that is made in lieu of taxes to the District government. The Federal Government occupies roughly 45 percent of the land area of this city. This payment is our contribution to the local community for the police, fire, and other services that are provided not only to Congress, but to the Federal offices and foreign embassies and various groups that have received congressionally chartered tax exemptions, not to mention the millions and millions of tourists and other visitors who come here either to see the beauty of our Nation's Capital or to participate in government or in business.

The second point I want to make is that the amount we are recommending

in this bill for fiscal year 1997 is exactly the same amount that was appropriated in each of the last 2 years. In other words, this will make it 3 years in a row with no increase—a flat Federal payment appropriation for the past 3 years for the District of Columbia.

Third, the Constitution places the responsibility for the District under the Congress, and it is our duty to provide a fair contribution for the operation of the seat of our national Government.

Mr. Chairman, the District is in the midst of a financial crisis. In response to that crisis, this Congress last year passed legislation to create a financial control board. That board has been in place a little over a year and is making some progress in grappling with the situation.

I would say to my good friend and colleague from Minnesota that we are appropriating exactly the amount authorized by his committee. The authorizers told us this is the amount that we should spend, and in respect to that committee and in respect to the process, we are appropriating at exactly that level. If the gentleman wishes to change that authorization, he is on the committee that can make that change.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment. We should not shirk our responsibility to our Nation's Capital by reducing the Federal payment to a level below what it was 3 years ago.

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, first off I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] also in the authorizing committee, for their hard work. Washington, DC, is our national Capital. It is seen across this country as a symbol of our Nation, it is seen throughout the world as a symbol of our Nation, and its efforts to try to improve the situation there and to shepherd it are to be commended, and as my colleagues well know, as we go through this amendment process, these amendments are not aimed at any particular committee or any particular approach.

I also serve on the authorizing committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and as my colleagues know, authorizing numbers are a cap, they are not the actual amount. That is up to the appropriating committee what they spend, and when we got our authorizing cap, we did not realize that the budget was going to have a bump up in the second year. That came later in the whole negotiating process, and some of the appropriating numbers got bumped up in dealing with the President and with the Senate, and we did not come to Congress to watch the deficit go up our second year here. We made a commitment to the American people that that deficit was going

to go down. And we did better than expected last year. Now we have a challenge to meet.

One of our concerns as fellow Republicans is that some of the rhetoric that has been used against our 1.9 percent amendment is potentially digging our party into a trap. Next year our discretionary spending is supposed to go down 4 percent in actual dollars. Non-defense spending is supposed to go down 4 percent in our own budget that we voted for, yet we constantly hear every time we bring up this amendment, "Oh, there's nothing that can be cut, there's nothing that can be reduced." If there is nothing that can be reduced, how in the world are we going to reduce things 4 percent next year?

Every time we bring this up, we hear over and over that, oh, we are going to wipe out this, we are going to wipe out that, and if we are not careful, we are going to hoist ourselves on our own rhetoric and dig ourselves into a hole. The fact is that the budget deficit goes up, I wish we could target it more precisely, I wish we could have worked it out through the different appropriating committees to be fair and rather than doing a 1.9 percent, but at this point since we do not have a lockbox that works, this is our only way to have the budget deficit not go up the second year.

Any my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, this is not aimed at the District of Columbia. I commend not only the delegate from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] and many of the others for their efforts, but quite frankly we did not control the House for 40 years. We have a terrible deficit that we have to get control of, that we were making progress, and we are very nervous that this step backward that we are doing, ever so slight a step, but nevertheless a step, is in the wrong direction, and the American people sent many of us here because they were tired of hearing "tomorrow, tomorrow, tomorrow." They want to see it happen now, and this is our only way we have to express our frustration not only with our own leadership, but our frustration with the way Congress works.

Every program has some benefits, every spending has some benefits, but we do not have any money. Even at the extreme it will take 7 years to balance our budget on an annual basis. Households do not have that choice, businesses do not have that choice, State governments do not have that choice, local governments do not have that choice, yet every time we try to reduce it just 1.9 percent it is always too much.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment on my colleague's remarks.

We have made, I think, tremendous progress in reducing our deficit spending. This Congress reduced discretionary spending by \$56 billion last year, a remarkable and astounding feat, given past performance, and no one in this body is more committed to

reducing deficit spending or reducing our deficits than I. We have, I think, made great effort here to reduce the projected deficit by an additional \$59 million or 60 percent to bring this budget closer to balance. It may take another year before we get there, but we are heading in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Every day we open the newspaper or turn on TV we see a problem that needs to be fixed in the District of Columbia. We need to restore the infrastructure to the water system here. Public health, in my personal view, is in a crisis in the District of Columbia. And public safety, even 60 Minutes is now paying attention to it.

The gentleman from Minnesota seems to say that because he offered this amendment on 12 other bills that he must offer it on this bill. I would suggest to the body that we respond to him the same way that we did on the other 12 bills and reject this amendment.

□ 1745

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I do have some regrets about having to offer this amendment, but I think it needs to be put in perspective in terms of how much money is actually spent here in the District of Columbia.

The per capita total spending, for example, in States like Nevada, is \$4,900. Here in the District it is \$9,954. There is waste. They could reduce spending by 1.9 percent without dramatically affecting public safety and the waterworks and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Ms. HOSTETTLER], my freshman colleague.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to the fiscal year 1997 District of Columbia appropriations bill to decrease funding in the bill by 1.9 percent across the board. I believe that this is the seventh time we have come to the floor to offer this amendment. While we have not been successful with our previous efforts, we are not discouraged. When it comes to protect the financial future of this country's children, we must be tireless.

While many come to the Chamber and criticized the budget resolution for increasing the deficit, few of us supported these efforts to regain that extra spending. Before we decide that we just can't resist the temptation to spend these few extra dollars—those few extra dollars that represent the thousands of hours of hard work performed by hard working folks in my district—we should think about the fi-

nancial burden we are placing on our children.

This amendment will trim less than 2 percent—just two pennies from every dollar of discretionary spending in this appropriations bill. The District receives approximately \$717 million in the form of a Federal payment, a payment to the teachers', firefighters', police, and judges' retirement fund, and a payment for this 1997 inauguration. Included among the reasons that the District receives the Federal payment is the notion that a large percentage of the city's land is owned by the Federal Government. In actuality, just over 26 percent of the city's property is owned by the Federal Government. However, 68 percent of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government, 64 percent of Utah is owned by the Federal Government, and a whopping 83 percent of the State of Nevada is owned by the Federal Government. At the same time, Alaskans receive \$1,755 per capita in Federal revenues; Utah residents receive \$634 in per capita Federal revenues; and Nevada residents receive just \$547. District residents, on the other hand, receive \$3,898 per capita in Federal revenues. When we consider these facts, a 1.9 percent decrease in the Federal payment seems like a small amount to ask for. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe this is the most perfect solution for cutting \$4 billion from the appropriations bills, and I can assure you that this is not being done to target any specific appropriations bill or any specific program—but this is a solution that will be shared by all. I asked everybody in this body—from both sides of the aisle—who is serious about staying on that real path toward a balanced budget to support our amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

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

I am inclined to simply say, "Enough already." Mr. Chairman, look at this week's U.S. News and World Report. The National Capital, the gentleman's capital, has become a national daily controversy. You cannot separate yourself from that.

There is a reason why the chairman of the committee on which you serve and the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations oppose this bill. This is not an appropriation we are dealing with; this is a city we are dealing with. It is a city that is insolvent.

These across-the-board cuts have been offered before in the Congress, but never for the District of Columbia appropriation. There is a reason for it. It is a complicated organism we are dealing with here. It is down on its knees, going, going, gone.

The Federal payment has not increased in 5 years. For the third year in a row the chairman has required a cut in the District's payment. Mr. Chairman, the PILOT we have here,

PILOT, the payment in lieu of taxes, keeps us from building on the most valuable and most useful land in the city, right in the middle of the city.

Let me tell the Members something: Congress has not paid its taxes recently, because the PILOT has not been increased in 5 years. Before that, until 1991, it had not been increased in 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, we have been using a monolithic strategy to downsize the District of Columbia. We have been using that even before the 104th Congress came into place. It is going down so fast that the taxpayers are picking up and leaving at a rate that should make your hair stand on end.

I have not called for an end of downsizing or an end of cuts, but after a control board and a Committee on Appropriations have looked closely at a city that is on the verge of dying and cut and said no more cuts, it ill behooves any of us to come to this floor and, shall we say, third-guess them on what should be done.

The 1.9-percent cut, you are not selling anything, I do not know why you do not say 2 percent cut and round off this figure, the 2-percent cut I think is sincerely offered, and it is sincerely received.

I ask Members to note the difference between an ordinary appropriation and a city in the deepest possible trouble. I ask Members to realize that the 2-percent cut has more than been made by, first, the control board, then the subcommittee, then the Committee on Appropriations, and now, it would appear, by the full body here. Please vote against this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I serve on this committee, and I have the greatest respect for our committee chairman and for the ranking minority member and for all the work that has been done here. However, when we get done looking at all of these priorities individually, we have to come back to the fact that we have a higher priority, and that is to do what is right for the future of our country.

We are \$5.2 trillion in debt. The time has come for us to do what is right for future generations of Americans and get to a balanced budget. This is simply a small step in the right direction for the future of this great country of ours. That is what this is all about.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I particularly praise the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the authorizing commit-

tee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS]. Both are doing an outstanding job, and are the hardest workers in this Congress.

I have a high regard for my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], on the committee on which I serve, but I must oppose his amendment. I think enough. We have cut budgets as much as we reasonably can.

Washington must remain a beautiful world capital. It is a beautiful world capital, but there are a couple of things I would like to ask a question of the chairman about, to see if we could change. That is, driving around town yesterday, I found numerous stoplights never replaced, crossing walk lights never replaced, potholes never filled. I think that is the impression every single visitor to Washington gets.

If we are going to put in this Federal contribution, can we at least get the District Department of Public Works to do something about simple matters like that, that do affect life and death?

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's questions, we are all very much aware of all of these problems in the city. I would remind my colleague that these did not just happen overnight. The bridges and roads and infrastructure and police cars and fire engines have been running on basically empty for years. There has been no investment in the schools. The city's capital program basically does not exist.

The fact is, the District of Columbia's budget is over \$5 billion for a city of 550,000 people. The State of South Carolina, with 3½ million people, has a budget of \$4 billion. So it would seem that there is enough money.

We have discussed this with the city officials and have urged them to spend money on these public works projects. Basically the funds in this bill are at their discretion to spend, but we do strongly urge them to make these structural repairs and changes to turn the District around from its downward spiral.

Mr. HORN. If I might suggest to the chairman of the Committee, if he would condition the Federal payment, I think they would move a lot faster.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance on my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I will end this debate the way I began. I do respect the work that is done on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. This is a very serious problem. But I would have to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER], who spoke earlier. The problem is not necessarily that there is

not enough tax money flowing through the District of Columbia.

On a per capita basis, if we compare the schools, for example, how much we spend back in Minnesota on our public schools, something like \$5,600. Here in the District of Columbia, by some estimates, it is almost \$10,000. The problem is not that we are not spending enough money, but the District and the Federal Government, as oversight, have not been ensuring that those moneys are spent properly.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment is really about is keeping our promises of last year. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] said, if we cannot cut 1.9 percent this year, how are we going to cut 4 percent next year? Balancing the budget is not what you do next year, it is not what you do 2 years from now, it is what you do this year.

I think we have to keep faith with what we told the voters 2 years ago. I think we have to keep faith with our children. This is about generational equity, it is not about whether potholes are going to be filled in Washington, DC. They have not been filled in the past and perhaps they will not be filled in the future. But we can balance the Federal budget, if everybody is willing to tighten their belts just a little bit.

If we take 1.9 percent across-the-board and we compare it to a haircut, and what we are talking about is giving the bureaucracy a slight haircut, it is like cutting your hair about one-eighth of an inch. Most people would not even notice the difference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just to sum up, we certainly have worked very hard to try to get this bill to where it is today. Basically it is a bipartisan bill. Not everyone is happy with it.

Is it the right amount of Federal funds? I believe it is. If we were to reduce another \$12 million, \$13 million, the District could take that from wherever they decide to take it. We just put \$15 million back in for the fire department. I would hate to think that is where it would come from.

The fact is this \$660 million Federal payment is the amount that was authorized, and is the amount included in our 602(b) allocation. I think it is the right amount, and I would strongly urge a "no" vote on the Gutknecht amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 18, 1996, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will be postponed.

Are there further amendments?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 18, 1996, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: First, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], followed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 223, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—176

Abercrombie	Doggett	Kennedy (MA)
Ackerman	Dooley	Kennedy (RI)
Andrews	Dunn	Kennelly
Baesler	Edwards	Klecicka
Baldacci	Engel	Klug
Balenger	Eshoo	Kolbe
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Lantos
Bass	Farr	Lazio
Bateman	Fattah	Levin
Becerra	Fawell	Lewis (GA)
Beilenson	Fields (LA)	Lofgren
Bentsen	Filner	Lowe
Berman	Foglietta	Luther
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Maloney
Bishop	Franks (NJ)	Markey
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Martinez
Boehlert	Frost	Martini
Bonilla	Furse	McCarthy
Boucher	Gejdenson	McDermott
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	McHale
Brown (OH)	Gilchrist	McKinney
Bryant (TX)	Gilman	Meehan
Campbell	Gonzalez	Meek
Cardin	Gordon	Menendez
Castle	Green (TX)	Meyers
Chapman	Greenwood	Millender-
Clay	Harman	McDonald
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
Clyburn	Hefner	Minge
Coleman	Hilliard	Moakley
Collins (IL)	Hinche	Molinari
Collins (MI)	Hobson	Moran
Condit	Horn	Nadler
Conyers	Houghton	Obey
Coyne	Hoyer	Olver
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Davis	(TX)	Payne (NJ)
DeFazio	Jacobs	Payne (VA)
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (FL)
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Pickett
Dicks	Johnston	Pomeroy
Dingell	Kaptur	Ramstad
Dixon	Kelly	Rangel

Reed	Shays
Regula	Sisisky
Richardson	Skaggs
Rivers	Slaughter
Rose	Spratt
Roukema	Stark
Roybal-Allard	Stokes
Sabo	Studds
Sanders	Tanner
Sawyer	Thompson
Schiff	Thurman
Schroeder	Torkildsen
Schumer	Torres
Scott	Trafficant
Serrano	Velazquez

NOES—223

Archer	Gillmor
Armey	Goodlatte
Bachus	Goodling
Baker (CA)	Goss
Baker (LA)	Graham
Barcia	Greene (UT)
Barr	Gunderson
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht
Bartlett	Hall (OH)
Barton	Hall (TX)
Bereuter	Hamilton
Bevill	Hancock
Bilirakis	Hansen
Bliley	Hastert
Blute	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Hayes
Bonior	Hayworth
Bono	Hefley
Borski	Heineman
Brewster	Herger
Browder	Hilleary
Bryant (TN)	Hoekstra
Bunn	Hoke
Bunning	Holden
Burr	Hostettler
Burton	Hunter
Buyer	Hutchinson
Callahan	Hyde
Calvert	Inglis
Camp	Istook
Canady	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Jones
Chambliss	Kanjorski
Chenoweth	Kasich
Christensen	Kildee
Chrysler	Kim
Clinger	King
Coble	Kingston
Coburn	Klink
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg
Combest	LaFalce
Cooley	LaHood
Costello	Largent
Cox	Latham
Crane	LaTourette
Crapo	Laughlin
Creameans	Leach
Cubin	Lewis (CA)
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)
Danner	Lightfoot
Daniel	Linder
DeLay	Lipinski
Diaz-Balart	Livingston
Dickey	LoBiondo
Doolittle	Longley
Dornan	Lucas
Doyle	Manton
Dreier	Mascara
Duncan	McCollum
Ehlers	McCrery
Ehrlich	McHugh
English	McInnis
Ensign	McIntosh
Ewing	McKeon
Flanagan	McNulty
Foley	Metcalf
Forbes	Mica
Fowler	Miller (FL)
Fox	Mollohan
Frisa	Montgomery
Funderburk	Moorhead
Galleghy	Murtha
Ganske	Myers
Gekas	Myrick
Geren	Neumann

Vento	Lincoln
Visclosky	Manzullo
Ward	Matsui
Waters	McDade
Watt (NC)	Mink
Waxman	Morella
White	Neal
Williams	Nethercutt
Wise	Norwood
Woolsey	Owens
Wynn	Pryce
Yates	Quillen
Zimmer	Rush
	Smith (MI)

Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Wilson
Young (FL)

Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1818

This Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mrs. Morella for, with Mr. Everett against.

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

Messrs. VENTO, BASS, and BOEHLERT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 229, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No 333]

AYES—170

Archer	Edwards	Laughlin
Bachus	English	Leach
Baker (CA)	Ensign	Lewis (KY)
Barcia	Ewing	Linder
Barr	Foley	LoBiondo
Barrett (WI)	Fowler	Lofgren
Bartlett	Fox	Lucas
Barton	Funderburk	Luther
Bilbray	Ganske	Martini
Bilirakis	Geren	Mascara
Blute	Gillmor	McCollum
Brewster	Goodlatte	McHale
Browder	Gordon	McInnis
Bryant (TN)	Goss	McIntosh
Bunning	Graham	Metcalf
Burton	Green (TX)	Meyers
Buyer	Gutknecht	Mica
Callahan	Hamilton	Miller (FL)
Camp	Hancock	Minge
Campbell	Hansen	Molinari
Canady	Harman	Montgomery
Chabot	Hastert	Moorhead
Chambliss	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Chenoweth	Hayes	Neumann
Christensen	Hayworth	Ney
Chrysler	Hefley	Nussle
Coble	Herger	Orton
Coburn	Hilleary	Paxon
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Peterson (MN)
Combest	Hoekstra	Petri
Condit	Hoke	Pombo
Cooley	Holden	Portman
Cox	Hostettler	Radanovich
Cramer	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Crane	Inglis	Richardson
Crapo	Istook	Roberts
Creameans	Jacobs	Roemer
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	Kasich	Roth
DeFazio	Kelly	Roukema
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Royce
Dickey	Klecicka	Salmon
Dornan	Klug	Sanford
Doyle	LaHood	Saxton
Dreier	Largent	Schaefer
Duncan	Latham	Schroeder

NOT VOTING—34

Allard	Durbin	Ford
Brown (FL)	Everett	Frank (MA)
Brownback	Fazio	Gephardt
Fields (TX)	Fields (TX)	Gutierrez
Flake	Flake	Jefferson

Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon

Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Thornberry
Tiaht
Upton
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Zimmer

Owens
Pryce
Quillen
Rush

Smith (MI)
Thornton
Torrice
Towns

Wilson
Young (FL)

Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer

Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinche
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCry
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney

McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—229

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armed
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Burr
Calvert
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
Davis
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa

Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinche
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Longley
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy
McCrary
McDermott
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Myers

Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

□ 1827

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Everett for, with Mrs. Morella against. So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, under the previous order of the House of July 18, 1996, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 3845), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 18, 1996, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Pursuant to that order of the House of July 18, 1996, the previous question is ordered.

□ 1830

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if proceedings resume on the three postponed questions on agreeing to motions to suspend the rules immediately after an electronic vote on the question of passing H.R. 3845, then the Speaker may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each of the postponed questions.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 332, nays 68, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—332

Allard
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Clement
de la Garza
Durbn
Everett
Fazio

Fields (TX)
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Jefferson
Lincoln

Manzullo
Matsui
McDade
Mink
Morella
Neal
Nethercutt
Norwood

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armed
Bachus

Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)

Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen

Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Creameans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Durbn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost

Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinche
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCry
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney

McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker

NOT VOTING—34

Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf

Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NAYS—68

Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barr
Barton
Brewster
Campbell
Chenoweth
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cramer
Crapo
Dornan
Duncan
Fowler
Funderburk
Gillmor
Gilman
Goss
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock

NOT VOTING—33

Allard
Brownback
Clement
Clinger
de la Garza
Everett
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)

□ 1846

Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3267, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3536, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3159, by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for all electronic vote in this series.

CHILD PILOT SAFETY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3267, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 5, not voting 33, as follows:

YEAS—395

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bilely
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chryslers
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—395

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)

Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder

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

NAYS—5

Cooley
Laughlin

NOT VOTING—33

Allard
Brownback
Clement
de la Garza
Everett
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gephardt

□ 1855

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRLINE PILOT HIRING AND SAFETY ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3536, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3536, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer

Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Ballenger
Barcia

Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia