

Lampson	Murtha	Sisisky
Lantos	Nadler	Skaggs
Levin	Neal	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Oberstar	Slaughter
Lipinski	Obey	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Olver	Smith, Adam
Lofgren	Ortiz	Snyder
Lowey	Owens	Spratt
Luther	Pallone	Stabenow
Maloney (CT)	Pascarel	Stark
Maloney (NY)	Pastor	Stokes
Manton	Payne	Strickland
Markey	Pelosi	Stupak
Martinez	Pomeroy	Tauscher
Mascara	Poshard	Thompson
Matsui	Price (NC)	Thurman
McCarthy (MO)	Quinn	Tierney
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Torres
McDade	Rangel	Towns
McDermott	Reyes	Traficant
McGovern	Rivers	Turner
McHale	Roemer	Velazquez
McHugh	Rothman	Vento
McKinney	Royal-Allard	Visclosky
McNulty	Rush	Waters
Meehan	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Meek	Sanchez	Waxman
Menendez	Sanders	Weller
Metcalf	Sandlin	Wexler
Millender-	Sawyer	Weygand
McDonald	Schiff	Wise
Miller (CA)	Schumer	Woolsey
Mink	Scott	Wynn
Moakley	Serrano	Yates
Mollohan	Sherman	Young (AK)
Moran (VA)	Shimkus	

NOT VOTING—1

Kaptur

□ 1721

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MASS MAILINGS

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I seek this time to engage the gentleman from Delaware in a colloquy in regard to his amendment on the fiscal year 1997 appropriation bill that discloses the costs of mass mailings.

I yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for purposes of clarification of his amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

My amendment provides for greater disclosure of franked mass mail costs than is currently provided. It requires that the statement, "this mass mailing was prepared, published and mailed at taxpayer expense" be printed on each mass mailing. It requires that on a quarterly basis the total number of

pieces and the total cost of such mass mailings sent by each Member of Congress be disclosed to the public.

It also provides for piece and cost comparisons based on the number of addresses that are in each district.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated that his amendment included the term "total cost." By total cost, notwithstanding what those words mean, did the gentleman mean to include the associated printing and production costs of mass mailings such as computer time, print costs, paper costs, and ink costs?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my primary concern has been the cost of mailing franked mail. I have been a staunch supporter of reducing the franked mail appropriation and am very pleased by the effort that has been made in recent years to rein in these costs, mostly under the gentleman's tutelage.

The cost of mailing franked mail as presently reported does not differentiate between unsolicited mass mail and constituent response mail. Thus watchdog groups which report on how much of a Member's franked mail budget is used are unable to make this distinction, which I believe is an important one.

It is the responsibility and obligation of Members to respond to their constituents, and I think the public supports this use of taxpayer dollars. Unsolicited mass mail falls into a different category. Yet the public has no way of knowing how much Members are spending to mail unsolicited mass mail. This is the issue I was trying to address with my amendment.

The other body's administrative system makes it easy for that body to report its Members' mailing costs and production costs of franked mail. However, given that the House does not yet have a system set up to do this and given that production costs were not the target of my amendment, I believe that Members should not be required to report production costs.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman because the House does not yet have a way to capture the printing and production costs. If the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, as stated, is to disclose to the public the mailing costs of mass mailings, that can easily be accomplished.

I thank the gentleman for his clarification as well as for his efforts in reforming the use of the frank.

□ 1730

PROPOSED RESCISSION OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 105-57)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one proposed rescission of budgetary resources, totaling \$10 million.

The proposed rescission affects the Department of Energy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 1997.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Twenty-fifth Annual Report on Environmental Quality.

As a nation, the most important thing we can do as we move into the 21st century is to give all our children the chance to live up to their God-given potential and live out their dreams. In order to do that, we must offer more opportunity and demand more responsibility from all our citizens. We must help young people get the education and training they need, make our streets safer from crime, help Americans succeed at home and at work, protect our environment for generations to come, and ensure that America remains the strongest force for peace and freedom in the world. Most of all, we must come together as one community to meet our challenges.

Our Nation's leaders understood this a quarter-century ago when they launched the modern era of environmental protection with the National Environmental Policy Act. NEPA's authors understood that environmental protection, economic opportunity, and social responsibility are interrelated. NEPA determined that the Federal Government should work in concert with State and local governments and citizens "to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans."

We've made great progress in 25 years as we've sought to live up to that challenge. As we look forward to the next 25 years of environmental progress, we do so with a renewed determination. Maintaining and enhancing our environment, passing on a clean world to future generations, is a sacred obligation of citizenship. We all have an interest in clean air, pure water, safe

food, and protected national treasures. Our environment is, literally, our common ground.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 1997.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CANADY of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A SUCCESSFUL BIPARTISAN RETREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I think we have established a bit of a tradition by now that when those of us that have been involved in putting together the bipartisan retreat in Hershey are here to talk about that, we will make the symbolic gesture of going to the other podium and talking to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in part.

It has been interesting in the days since the weekend in Hershey to notice how many references have been made to the retreat to Hershey, to civility, both in debate on the floor and in the committee hearings that I have been a part of. I hope that is good evidence of things sort of taking seed, anyway. I know we have a great deal of work to do to make good on the beginnings that occurred at the retreat at Hershey, PA.

Before getting into a little bit of that, I just want to recognize and express my deep thanks to all that were involved in planning the weekend; my cochair, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD], and the other members of the planning committee that worked literally for months and months and months together, a gratifying experience in its own right, to put together with the help of some great outside experts a plan for the weekend.

Those colleagues included the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON], the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HINOJOSA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

As I think most of our colleagues are aware, we came away from the week-

end in Hershey with many excellent ideas. Those are going to be reviewed and vetted and scrubbed and we hope then produced as recommendations coming out of the continuing work of the planning committee, that I hope now can be called an execution committee. We have met once since the weekend and will be meeting again.

Among the things we have already put in place, and Members will be advised of this by correspondence to their office, is a briefing on the retreat, the evening of April 16, from 5 to 7 p.m., downstairs in HC-5, where we hope our colleagues who were not able to attend the weekend, and their spouses, if at all possible, can join many of us who were there and our spouses for an opportunity to review some of what went on that weekend, to take a look at a video that is being compiled of the opening session, which included remarks by the Speaker and the Democratic leader, as well as a truly inspirational talk by the historian David McCullough.

We will have a time for socializing a bit, as well as dealing substantively with what went on in the weekend at Hershey and what our hopes are for carrying forward in very concrete terms the many, many good ideas that came out of that weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD], for any comments he might wish to make at this point.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I too want to add my thanks to all of those who worked so hard on making the retreat possible, including the Pugh Charitable Foundation, the Aspen Institute, and the Congressional Institute. Those folks contributed mightily to making our weekend a success.

But in large measure it was successful because of the Members who came, the 200 Members, about equally divided between Republican and Democratic Members, and then about 150 spouses and 100 children, and the weekend was a success because of the fact that Members took the time to come. The kind of encouragement that Members have been exhibiting to carry on the suggestions that were made at the weekend I think means a great deal.

I hope that our group can get together and come up with some recommendations. I think many of the recommendations have a great deal to do more with running the House, the institution of the House, how to make it more effective in the sense that people have a chance to debate, knowing that there are going to be differences, there are going to be partisan and political differences, but in reality when we leave the floor and the vote has been cast people will continue to talk to one another and carry on discussions beyond the House floor, and it does not relegate itself to the extent that Members will not carry on conversations after they leave the House floor.

Mr. SKAGGS. The gentleman's point is very well made. There have been some who have wanted to misconstrue our efforts in this regard as somehow getting rid of disagreement, which could not be further from the truth.

We recognize, I think, that representing this big country of ours—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That request may not be entertained by the Chair. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if I may finish this one sentence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the place of my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. MCINNIS], in the 5-minute rotation today.

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

There was no objection.

LOCKHEED MARTIN TO ROLLOUT F-22 ON APRIL 9 IN MARIETTA, GA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Just to complete the thought with my friend from Illinois, we just wanted to make sure that folks understand that our purposes are not to eliminate disagreements, which are inevitable, given the strongly held views that we have on the many important issues facing the country.

What we do believe is that we can replace what was becoming ever more sour debate among us with healthy debate which will live up to the expectations that I think the country and we hold for this institution.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I rise today to celebrate what I think is going to be a very historic moment in the national security of this country. On April 9, 1997, in Marietta, GA, at the Lockheed Martin plant we will have the rollout of the F-22.

I rise today along with my colleague from the 7th District of Georgia, [Mr. BARR], to talk about this historic event and to say that it marks the dawn of air dominance for the United States of America in the 21st century. The F-22 will be the fighter for the United States of America in the future.

The F-22 contains three major characteristics that will allow the United States of America to maintain the air dominance that we have been able to maintain in every major conflict over the last 40 years. Those three attributes, those three assets, are: