

This legislation will provide much needed assistance to the victims of the floods, and support our Nation's peacekeeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

Those provisions which were included in the first submission of this legislation to the President for his signature have been removed. The subjects that were included; an automatic budget resolution, federally funded roads into national forest areas, and restriction of sampling in any future Census.

These areas are serious and each should be considered under the well established congressional legislative democratic process, through hearings, markup, and floor debate. Their exclusion from this Emergency Supplemental Appropriations therefore was the right course for the House leadership to take. Now, we can begin the process of seeking the best policy to further the interest of all Americans in each of these areas.

I believe that every Member of this body will agree that the suffering of others as a result of any cause is difficult to see. The pain of people who are the victims of natural disaster is particularly painful. There is nothing this body could do to legislate the next natural disaster out of existence, but we can agree that we will never again let issues that are unrelated enter into the legislative relief effort.

The least that Members of this body can offer the next victims of natural disaster in our country, is the promise that their best interest will be our only consideration when rendering them aid and assistance through funding legislation.

I would ask that my colleagues join me in support of H.R. 1871, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Send It Clean. This is not a complicated message: Send It Clean, Mr. Speaker. It's been 85 days since the President asked the Congress for a disaster relief bill, and for 85 days the Republican leadership has played politics with the lives of suffering Americans. These people have asked for only one thing: Relief. What has the GOP responded with? More pain and suffering.

This is not a complicated message: Send It Clean, Mr. Speaker. This is what the President has been saying; This is what the American people have been saying; This is what House Democrats have been saying; This is what Republicans have been ignoring for 85 days.

Disaster Relief was never the place for the Republican agenda to be advanced. Extraneous bills should be argued on their own merits, and be allowed to stand or fall on those merits.

The folks trying to rebuild their lives in California, North Dakota, Minnesota, Arkansas, and Louisiana are waiting for word that the Democrats are not the only ones listening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the bill is considered read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

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 348, nays 74, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—348

Abercrombie	English	Kucinich	Roukema	Stabenow	Watt (NC)
Ackerman	Ensign	LaHood	Royal-Allard	Stark	Watts (OK)
Aderholt	Eshoo	Lampson	Sabo	Stokes	Waxman
Allen	Etheridge	Lantos	Sanchez	Strickland	Weldon (PA)
Andrews	Evans	Latham	Sanders	Stump	Weller
Bachus	Everett	LaTourette	Sandlin	Stupak	Wexler
Baesler	Ewing	Lazio	Sawyer	Sununu	Weygand
Baker	Fattah	Leach	Saxton	Talent	White
Baldacci	Fawell	Levin	Schumer	Tanner	Whitfield
Ballenger	Fazio	Lewis (CA)	Scott	Tauscher	Wicker
Barcia	Filner	Lewis (GA)	Serrano	Tauzin	Wise
Barrett (NE)	Foglietta	Lewis (KY)	Shaw	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Barrett (WI)	Foley	Linder	Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey
Bateman	Ford	Lipinski	Shimkus	Thomas	Wynn
Becerra	Fowler	Livingston	Shuster	Thompson	Yates
Bentsen	Fox	LoBiondo	Sisisky	Thune	Young (AK)
Bereuter	Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Skaggs	Thurman	Young (FL)
Berman	Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Skeen	Tierney	
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lucas			NAYS—74
Bilirakis	Frost	Luther	Archer	Duncan	Paxon
Bishop	Furse	Maloney (CT)	Armey	Goodling	Pease
Blagojevich	Gallegly	Maloney (NY)	Barr	Graham	Petri
Bliley	Ganske	Manton	Bartlett	Hastert	Riley
Blumenauer	Gejdenson	Manzullo	Barton	Heffley	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Gekas	Markey	Bass	Hillenary	Royce
Boehlert	Gephart	Mascara	Bilbray	Hoekstra	Ryun
Bonior	Gibbons	Matsui	Boehner	Hulshof	Salmon
Bono	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)	Bonilla	Hunter	Sanford
Borski	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Brady	Inglis	Scarborough
Boswell	Gilman	McCollum	Burr	Istook	Schaefer, Dan
Boucher	Gonzalez	McCrery	Burton	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Bob
Boyd	Goode	McGovern	Buyer	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CA)	Goodlatte	McHale	Callahan	Kingston	Sessions
Brown (FL)	Gordon	McHugh	Campbell	Klug	Shadegg
Brown (OH)	Goss	McIntyre	Cannon	Largent	Shays
Bryant	Granger	McKeon	Chambliss	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Bunning	Green	McKinney	Christensen	McIntosh	Snowberger
Calvert	Greenwood	McNulty	Coburn	Mica	Stearns
Camp	Gutierrez	Meehan	Collins	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Canady	Gutknecht	Meek	Combest	Myrick	Thornberry
Capps	Hall (OH)	Menendez	Cox	Neumann	Tiahrt
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Crane	Norwood	Upton
Carson	Hamilton	Millender-	Deal	Nussle	Weldon (FL)
Castle	Hansen	McDonald	DeLay	Paul	
Chabot	Harman	Minge			
Chenoweth	Hastings (FL)	Mink			
Clay	Hastings (WA)	Moakley			
Clayton	Hayworth	Molinari			
Clement	Hefner	Mollohan			
Clyburn	Herger	Moran (KS)			
Coble	Hill	Moran (VA)			
Condit	Hilliard	Morella			
Conyers	Hinchey	Murtha			
Cook	Hinojosa	Nadler			
Cooksey	Hobson	Neal			
Costello	Holden	Nethercutt			
Coyne	Hooley	Ney			
Cramer	Horn	Northup			
Crapo	Hostettler	Oberstar			
Cubin	Houghton	Obey			
Cummings	Hoyer	Olver			
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Ortiz			
Danner	Hyde	Owens			
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Oxley			
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Packard			
Davis (VA)	(TX)	Pallone			
DeFazio	Jefferson	Pappas			
DeGette	Jenkins	Parker			
Delahunt	John	Pascrell			
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Pastor			
Dellums	Johnson (WI)	Payne			
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)			
Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)			
Dickey	Kaptur	Pickering			
Dicks	Kasich	Pickett			
Dingell	Kelly	Pitts			
Dixon	Kennedy (MA)	Pombo			
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy			
Dooley	Kennelly	Porter			
Doolittle	Kildee	Portman			
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Poshard			
Dreier	Kim	Price (NC)			
Dunn	King (WI)	Pryce (OH)			
Edwards	King (NY)	Quinn			
Ehlers	Kleczka	Radanovich			
Ehrlich	Klink	Rahall			
Emerson	Knollenberg	Ramstad			
Engel	Kolbe	Rangel			

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring what the schedule will be for tomorrow and the remainder of the week and for next week. Mr. Speaker, I am primarily interested in the time issue as much as I am in substance, and I think it would

be helpful for our colleagues if they knew when we would be meeting next week and when we can expect our first votes. If we do not have the substance of the schedule next week, I understand that, but if we can get some sense.

I have been given a tentative schedule, Mr. Speaker, that says we will have a pro forma session at noon on Monday; and then on Tuesday, we will go in at 12:30 for morning session, 2 o'clock for legislative business, and no recorded votes before 5 p.m.; and then also on Tuesday, the Private Calendar, five suspension bills; and on Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will meet at 10 a.m. and we will do the Sea Grant bill and the National Defense Authorization bill. That is a tentative schedule, and if that is helpful to our colleagues, I would like to have that verified by the other side, if they could.

Well, we will assume, Mr. Speaker, that that is the schedule for next week, and I wish all my colleagues a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaHood). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 16, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 1997 for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING ORDER OF HOUSE OF MAY 7, 1997 THROUGH JUNE 24, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of May 7, 1997, be extended through Tuesday, June 24, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS FOR FATHERS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with Father's Day coming up, what can we do to help dads and to help parents and help children? Our tax burden right now is one of the biggest problems of raising kids. I know. I have a family of four. If you have a combined income of \$55,000, \$22,000 of that goes to taxes. Indeed, there are 62 taxes hidden in a gallon of gas and 109 in a loaf of bread.

The Republican bill gives much needed middle class tax relief, for capital gains tax, HOPE scholarships, IRA expansion, death tax penalty, and, most importantly, to the fathers on Father's Day the \$500 per child tax credit.

Tax relief gives dads more time to stay at home to spend time with their children and impart values for the next generation. Unless the critics continue with the class envy that they are so clever at and so good, let me say that 71 percent of these taxes go to people with incomes of \$75,000 or less and only 1.2 percent with incomes over \$200,000. This is a middle class tax cut for fathers, and it is the Republican tax plan. I hope our Democrats will join us in supporting it.

The following shows the amount of tax relief received by people of various income categories over a five year period, according to data provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation: Under \$20,000, -\$5.5 billion (4.7%); \$20,000 to \$75,000, -\$83.5 billion (71.7%); \$75,000 to \$100,000, -\$19.3 billion (16.6%); \$100,000 to \$200,000, -\$6.7 billion (5.8%); \$200,000+, -\$1.4 billion (1.2%).

□ 1715

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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.

ATTEMPTS DURING BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS TO COME THROUGH THE BACK DOOR ON ISSUES OF WORKER PAY AND PROTECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this House the fact that we have some actions that are going on as we attempt to bring together this budget and to reconcile the differences in the deliberations that have gone on, attempts to come through the back door on some very important issues.

I am very concerned about attempts to treat welfare recipients who are

would-be welfare workers differently than we treat other workers in America's workplace. I am concerned that there is an attempt to pay welfare workers less than minimum wage. I am also concerned that there is an attempt to deny workplace protections for recipients who go to work. I am also concerned that along with these two mean-spirited denials of protections in the workplace we find an attempt to deny protection from discrimination.

One would ask, how could this be in 1997, when all of these gains that have been made are gains that were hard fought for, gains that individuals made tremendous sacrifices for? How could we in 1997 have attempts to turn back the clock?

We know that in the last Congress there were some attempts by Republicans to deny an increase in minimum wage. That issue was hotly debated. We had the American public join in that debate in ways that we have not had the American public involved in in a long time. We engaged the citizens of this country in that debate. The citizens spoke in a loud and clear voice.

What did they say to us? They said, not only do we want an increase in minimum wage, we want the American people to be paid fairly for their labor. We do not think this increase is enough. We think it should be more. We do not like the fact that major CEO's in America are making a million dollars while there is an attempt to continue to squeeze the workers at the bottom. We do not like the fact that entry-level wages have gone down. We do not like the fact that more and more Americans are on part-time labor. We do not like the fact that American workers are going to the negotiating table, not fighting for increases, but are forced to have to fight to hold onto the gains that have been made historically.

So the American people spoke, and they spoke loud and clear. When the American people spoke, we discovered that even some of those on the other side of the aisle who had been attempting to deny this increase in minimum wage got the message. They got the message and they joined with us in the final analysis and supported the increase in minimum wage.

I thought all of the Republicans had learned a lesson. I thought they had heard the American public. But obviously that is not the case, because what we see now is a back-door attempt, a back-door attempt to not only deny that increase that we made for low-wage workers, but an attempt to single out a category of workers and pay them less than the minimum wage. What they could not do in the front door they are now trying to do through the back door.

What they are literally doing is sending a message out to workers, many of them who only make minimum wages, your job is in jeopardy. Your job is in jeopardy because we have found a whole new class of people that we are