

gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a brief comment because of the tenor of this discussion.

As someone who has reached a conclusion that there are occasions when capital punishment is appropriate, I am aware that other people have reached a different conclusion. I can respect those people. And this is a first time as a Member of this body that I have heard this discussion without the implication that those who have reached a different conclusion are somehow less concerned about crime or less opposed to wrongdoing. I wanted to note that and thank the gentleman from Tennessee for understanding that we can have different beliefs and yet be united in opposition to crime.

□ 1730

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENKINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1348, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1757, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999, AND EUROPEAN SECURITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on International Relations, pursuant to House Rule XX, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of the House bill (except title XXI) and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GILMAN, GOODLING, LEACH, HYDE, BEREUTER, SMITH (NJ), HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, and BERMAN.

For consideration of title XXI of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GILMAN, HYDE, SMITH (NJ), HAMILTON, and GEJDENSON.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days on which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material and charts therein.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BALLENGER]. Pursuant to House Resolution 197 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2209.

□ 1733

#### 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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD 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 New York [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the floor H.R. 2209, the fiscal year 1998 legislative appropriations bill. This is the first year I have had the pleasure of chairing this subcommittee.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the former chairman of the subcommittee, has set a very high standard for us to follow. I want to recognize the members of the Subcommittee on Legislative who have assisted me in bringing this bill to the floor.

First, let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the vice-chairman of the subcommittee. In addition, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM] all have contributed to the work on this bill.

My colleague and good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], the other part of New York, downstate New York, is the ranking minority member. He is a great friend and has worked with me on a bipartisan basis throughout the process.

In addition, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] have helped shape this bill and have maintained the bipartisan spirit of the subcommittee. Also, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the full committee, have fully participated in the subcommittee's deliberations.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2209 provides \$1,711,417,000 in new budget authority. This bill is \$10 million below the 1997 bill. If I could repeat that, it is 0.6 percent lower than last year's appropriation, Senate excluded. This continues a 3-year trend of making the legislative branch smaller and indeed leading the way toward smaller government.

The Congressional Research Service, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office, has calculated that if the entire Federal budget were to be reduced in the same proportion as we have downsized the legislative branch, the entire Federal budget would show a surplus of \$183 billion for fiscal year 1998.

Here are a few general points about the bill:

We have continued the program begun in the 104th Congress to right-size the legislative branch. This is producing a more efficient, smaller work force by using technology wherever possible. The bill does not fund certain personnel costs, such as within-grade, promotion or merit pay increases. Legislative agencies will absorb these costs, just as the executive branch does.

The legislative branch work force is cut by an additional 316 positions. Since 1994, we have reduced FTE's, or full time equivalent positions, by over 3,800 positions. That is a reduction of almost 14 percent of the entire legislative branch work force. The FTE cut does not reduce agency programs. The current level of FTE's used by agencies has been maintained. However, funds for unused FTE's have been removed.

Some of the details in the bill include:

For the House of Representatives, \$708 million is provided. The Members' representational allowance appropriation has been increased to cover staff cost of living allowances. Committee funds have been increased by \$6.7 million and are extended through December 31, 1998. House administrative offices, the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, CAO, and others are funded at a net reduction of \$2 million. Within the CAO, HIR operational costs are reduced \$1.6 million.

For joint items, \$86.8 million is provided. The Joint Economic and Printing Committees are funded at the level requested in the budget submission. The Joint Tax Committee has been provided funds for five additional staff to accommodate an expanded workload.

The Capitol Police cost-of-living allowances are funded with the additional funds pending authorizing committee approval. An administrative provision establishes a unified pay and leave procedure for House and Senate details. For the Architect of the Capitol, \$122.9 million is provided.

Mr. Chairman, the Capitol buildings belong to the people of the United States. We have an obligation to keep up the maintenance needed to keep the buildings and grounds in working order and suitable for the work of Congress and to accommodate the millions of taxpayers and others who visit each year.

The Architect has estimated that the cost of maintenance and improvements over the next 5 years will require an additional \$254 million. This need must be addressed, although perhaps not the full amount. This bill begins to address the long-term Capitol investment program articulated by the new Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Alan M. Hantman, and we welcome him.

We must exercise judgment, however. In the bill, 68 percent of priority-one projects are funded. Safety and Americans with Disabilities Act work continues, including fire alarms, sprinklers, access doors, etc.

The initial funding for the rehabilitation of the Capitol dome has been provided. Mr. Chairman, there is no more important symbol of the American Na-

tion than that Capitol dome. Funding is also provided to commence replacement of the deteriorated floors of the parking garage in the Cannon Building. The Library of Congress, including CRS, is funded at \$342 million. We have also added \$160 million in other resources to the Library. The bill funds the current FTE level. The initial phase of the new bibliographic system is funded as is additional playback equipment for talking books for the blind.

For the Government Printing Office, almost \$100 million is provided. Congressional printing is funded at the fiscal year 1997 level, including an \$11 million transfer from the working capital fund, a transfer back to this account of funds paid out earlier to cover costs of non-congressional printing.

For the General Accounting Office, \$323.5 million is provided. This will allow 85 additional FTE positions over the current level. The Emergency Supplemental Act of 1997 provided GAO authority to enter into multiyear contracts. We have been told that up to \$8.4 million of funds requested for fiscal year 1998 may be obligated in fiscal year 1997 with this new authority. That provision enabled us to reduce the fiscal year 1998 appropriation by that amount.

Just a couple of notes, in summary, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues. The budget authority compared to the 1997 operating level: we are \$10 million, at 0.6 percent below. That is a reduction under 1997 appropriations. It is \$143 million less than the President's request for the legislative branch, and it is \$2.6 million below our 602(b) allocations.

Last, Mr. Chairman, on a note that does not get an awful lot of attention,

but I think it shows that we lead by example, not only in reducing the size of legislative branch. In the area of recycling, it should be noted that the House of Representatives recycling program has been operating for 6 years now.

A pilot test was done in 1990. The House-wide program was begun in 1993. It should also be noted that the program has been producing results. We have all heard of the rumors that we take our waste and we throw fine paper in one basket and we throw the sorted paper in another basket and then the cleaning people come up in at night and throw them all into one coffer. That is not the case.

I want to dispel that rumor. In fact, we have recycled 12,000, almost 13,000 tons of waste, including cans, bottles, and paper. The Architect has estimated that we have avoided over \$900,000 in landfill costs due to recycling waste. And here is the key point: We have also been told by the Architect of the Capitol that 1,977 tons of House trash and waste were recycled by a recycling contractor last year. That represents over 57 percent of the waste generated by House offices. That is a remarkable number, given the fact that the goal for the Federal Government is a 50-percent level of recycling. We are doing 57 percent, higher, to my knowledge, higher than any other branch of the Federal Government.

So, once again, Mr. Chairman, we are leading by example. We have shown that we are willing to lead in terms of recycling, but more importantly, that we continue to make government smaller, more efficient and saving money along the way.

**LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2209)**

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
<b>TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS</b>					
<b>HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES</b>					
<b>Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress</b>					
Gratuities, deceased Members.....	267,200			-267,200	
<b>Salaries and Expenses</b>					
<b>House Leadership Offices</b>					
Office of the Speaker .....	1,535,000	1,625,000	1,590,000	+55,000	-35,000
Office of the Majority Floor Leader .....	1,528,000	1,566,000	1,826,000	+100,000	+60,000
Office of the Minority Floor Leader .....	1,534,000	1,574,000	1,652,000	+118,000	+78,000
Office of the Majority Whip .....	957,000	983,000	1,024,000	+67,000	+41,000
Office of the Minority Whip .....	949,000	975,000	998,000	+49,000	+23,000
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities .....	378,000	378,000	397,000	+21,000	+19,000
Republican Steering Committee .....	664,000	680,000	736,000	+72,000	+56,000
Republican Conference.....	1,130,000	1,161,000	1,172,000	+42,000	+11,000
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee .....	1,191,000	1,222,000	1,277,000	+86,000	+55,000
Democratic Caucus .....	603,000	619,000	631,000	+28,000	+12,000
Nine minority employees.....	1,127,000	1,133,000	1,190,000	+63,000	+57,000
<b>Subtotal, House Leadership Offices.....</b>	<b>11,582,000</b>	<b>11,916,000</b>	<b>12,293,000</b>	<b>+701,000</b>	<b>+377,000</b>
<b>Members' Representational Allowances</b>					
Expenses .....	363,313,000	405,450,000	379,789,000	+16,476,000	-25,661,000
<b>Committee Employees</b>					
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)...	80,222,000	90,310,000	86,268,000	+6,046,000	-4,042,000
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	17,580,000	18,276,000	18,276,000	+696,000	
<b>Subtotal, Committee employees.....</b>	<b>97,802,000</b>	<b>108,586,000</b>	<b>104,544,000</b>	<b>+6,742,000</b>	<b>-4,042,000</b>
<b>Salaries, Officers and Employees</b>					
Office of the Clerk .....	15,074,000	14,715,000	16,804,000	+1,730,000	+2,089,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	3,638,000	3,598,000	3,564,000	-74,000	-34,000
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	55,209,000	59,688,000	50,727,000	-4,482,000	-8,961,000
Office of Inspector General.....	3,954,000	4,344,000	3,808,000	-146,000	-536,000
Office of the Chaplain.....	126,000	126,000	133,000	+7,000	+7,000
Office of the Parliamentarian .....	1,036,000	1,129,000	1,101,000	+65,000	-28,000
Office of the Parliamentarian .....	(786,000)	(861,000)	(852,000)	(+66,000)	(-9,000)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives .....	(250,000)	(268,000)	(249,000)	(-1,000)	(-19,000)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel.....	1,767,000	1,881,000	1,821,000	+54,000	-60,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel .....	4,687,000	4,824,000	4,827,000	+140,000	+3,000
Corrections Calendar Office .....		441,000	791,000	+791,000	+350,000
Other authorized employees .....	768,000	1,024,000	780,000	+12,000	-244,000
Former Speakers.....	(594,000)	(855,000)	(594,000)		(-261,000)
Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician .....	(174,000)	(169,000)	(186,000)	(+12,000)	(+17,000)
<b>Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees.....</b>	<b>86,259,000</b>	<b>91,770,000</b>	<b>84,356,000</b>	<b>-1,903,000</b>	<b>-7,414,000</b>
<b>Allowances and Expenses</b>					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims .....	2,374,000	2,977,000	2,225,000	-149,000	-752,000
Official mail (committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices).....	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	-500,000	-500,000
Document management system .....		1,500,000			-1,500,000
Reemployed annuitants reimbursements .....	71,000	71,000		-71,000	-71,000
Government contributions.....	120,779,000	128,451,000	124,390,000	+3,611,000	-4,061,000
Miscellaneous items .....	641,000	662,000	641,000		-21,000
<b>Subtotal, Allowances and expenses.....</b>	<b>124,865,000</b>	<b>134,661,000</b>	<b>127,756,000</b>	<b>+2,891,000</b>	<b>-6,905,000</b>
<b>Total, salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>683,831,000</b>	<b>752,383,000</b>	<b>708,738,000</b>	<b>+24,907,000</b>	<b>-43,645,000</b>
<b>Total, House of Representatives.....</b>	<b>684,098,200</b>	<b>752,383,000</b>	<b>708,738,000</b>	<b>+24,639,800</b>	<b>-43,645,000</b>

**LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2209)—Continued**

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
<b>JOINT ITEMS</b>					
Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1997 .....	950,000			-950,000	
Joint Economic Committee .....	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000		
Joint Committee on Printing.....	777,000	807,000	804,000	+27,000	-3,000
Joint Committee on Taxation .....	5,470,000	6,126,000	5,907,000	+437,000	-219,000
<b>Office of the Attending Physician</b>					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances.....	1,225,000	1,266,000	1,266,000	+41,000	
<b>Capitol Police Board</b>					
<b>Capitol Police</b>					
<b>Salaries:</b>					
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.....	33,437,000	35,507,000	34,118,000	+681,000	-1,389,000
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate .....	35,919,000	38,428,000	36,837,000	+918,000	-1,591,000
<b>Subtotal, salaries .....</b>	<b>69,356,000</b>	<b>73,935,000</b>	<b>70,955,000</b>	<b>+1,599,000</b>	<b>-2,980,000</b>
General expenses 1/.....	6,032,000	5,401,000	3,099,000	-2,933,000	-2,302,000
<b>Subtotal, Capitol Police .....</b>	<b>75,388,000</b>	<b>79,336,000</b>	<b>74,054,000</b>	<b>-1,334,000</b>	<b>-5,282,000</b>
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office .....	1,991,000	1,991,000	1,991,000		
Statements of Appropriations .....	30,000	30,000	30,000		
<b>Total, Joint Items.....</b>	<b>88,581,000</b>	<b>92,306,000</b>	<b>86,802,000</b>	<b>-1,779,000</b>	<b>-5,504,000</b>
<b>OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,609,000	2,600,000	2,479,000	-130,000	-121,000
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	24,532,000	24,995,000	24,797,000	+265,000	-198,000
<b>ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL</b>					
<b>Office of the Architect of the Capitol</b>					
Salaries .....	8,454,000			-8,454,000	
Travel (limitation on official travel expenses).....	(20,000)			(-20,000)	
Contingent expenses.....	100,000			-100,000	
<b>Subtotal, Office of the Architect of the Capitol.....</b>	<b>8,554,000</b>			<b>-8,554,000</b>	
<b>Capitol Buildings and Grounds</b>					
Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses 2/.....	23,505,000	42,064,000	36,827,000	+13,322,000	-5,237,000
Capitol grounds .....	5,020,000	6,618,000	4,991,000	-29,000	-1,627,000
House office buildings.....	32,556,000	39,403,000	37,181,000	+4,625,000	-2,222,000
Capitol Power Plant .....	34,749,000	37,771,000	36,032,000	+1,283,000	-1,739,000
Offsetting collections .....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000		
<b>Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....</b>	<b>30,749,000</b>	<b>33,771,000</b>	<b>32,032,000</b>	<b>+1,283,000</b>	<b>-1,739,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Capitol buildings and grounds .....</b>	<b>91,830,000</b>	<b>121,856,000</b>	<b>111,031,000</b>	<b>+19,201,000</b>	<b>-10,825,000</b>
<b>Total, Architect of the Capitol .....</b>	<b>100,384,000</b>	<b>121,856,000</b>	<b>111,031,000</b>	<b>+10,647,000</b>	<b>-10,825,000</b>
<b>LIBRARY OF CONGRESS</b>					
<b>Congressional Research Service</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	62,641,000	66,830,000	64,603,000	+1,962,000	-2,227,000
<b>GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE</b>					
Congressional printing and binding.....	81,669,000	84,025,000	70,652,000	-11,017,000	-13,373,000
(Transfer from revolving fund).....			(11,017,000)	(+11,017,000)	(+11,017,000)
<b>Total, title I, Congressional Operations .....</b>	<b>1,044,514,200</b>	<b>1,144,995,000</b>	<b>1,069,102,000</b>	<b>+24,587,800</b>	<b>-75,893,000</b>

1/ FY 1997 enacted includes \$3,250,000 provided in P.L. 104-208, Title V.

2/ FY 1997 enacted includes \$250,000 provided in P.L. 104-208, Title V.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2209)—Continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
<b>TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES</b>					
<b>BOTANIC GARDEN</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	36,402,000	11,662,000	1,771,000	-34,631,000	-9,891,000
<b>LIBRARY OF CONGRESS</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	216,007,000	232,058,000	223,507,000	+7,500,000	-8,551,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-7,869,000	-7,869,000	-7,869,000		
Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	208,138,000	224,189,000	215,638,000	+7,500,000	-8,551,000
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	33,402,000	35,787,000	34,361,000	+959,000	-1,426,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-22,269,000	-22,507,000	-22,426,000	-157,000	+81,000
Net subtotal, Copyright Office.....	11,133,000	13,280,000	11,935,000	+802,000	-1,345,000
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses.....	44,964,000	48,025,000	45,936,000	+972,000	-2,089,000
Furniture and furnishings.....	4,882,000	4,882,000	4,178,000	-704,000	-704,000
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS).....	269,117,000	290,376,000	277,687,000	+8,570,000	-12,689,000
<b>ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL</b>					
<b>Library Buildings and Grounds</b>					
Structural and mechanical care.....	9,753,000	15,755,000	10,073,000	+320,000	-5,682,000
<b>GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE</b>					
<b>Office of Superintendent of Documents</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	29,077,000	30,477,000	29,264,000	+187,000	-1,213,000
<b>GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	338,425,000	368,828,000	330,924,000	-7,501,000	-37,904,000
Offsetting collections.....	-5,905,000	-7,404,000	-7,404,000	-1,499,000	
Total, General Accounting Office.....	332,520,000	361,424,000	323,520,000	-9,000,000	-37,904,000
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	676,869,000	709,694,000	642,315,000	-34,554,000	-67,379,000
Grand total.....	1,721,383,200	1,854,689,000	1,711,417,000	-9,966,200	-143,272,000
<b>TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS</b>					
House of Representatives.....	684,098,200	752,383,000	708,738,000	+24,639,800	-43,645,000
Joint Items.....	88,581,000	92,306,000	86,802,000	-1,779,000	-5,504,000
Office of Compliance.....	2,609,000	2,600,000	2,479,000	-130,000	-121,000
Congressional Budget Office.....	24,532,000	24,995,000	24,797,000	+265,000	-198,000
Architect of the Capitol.....	100,384,000	121,856,000	111,031,000	+10,647,000	-10,825,000
Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service.....	62,641,000	66,830,000	64,603,000	+1,962,000	-2,227,000
Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office.....	81,669,000	84,025,000	70,852,000	-11,017,000	-13,373,000
Total, title I, Congressional operations.....	1,044,514,200	1,144,995,000	1,069,102,000	+24,587,800	-75,893,000
<b>TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES</b>					
Botanic Garden.....	36,402,000	11,662,000	1,771,000	-34,631,000	-9,891,000
Library of Congress (except CRS).....	269,117,000	290,376,000	277,687,000	+8,570,000	-12,689,000
Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings and grounds).....	9,753,000	15,755,000	10,073,000	+320,000	-5,682,000
Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding).....	29,077,000	30,477,000	29,264,000	+187,000	-1,213,000
General Accounting Office.....	332,520,000	361,424,000	323,520,000	-9,000,000	-37,904,000
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	676,869,000	709,694,000	642,315,000	-34,554,000	-67,379,000
Grand total.....	1,721,383,200	1,854,689,000	1,711,417,000	-9,966,200	-143,272,000

Mr. WALSH. The committee report contains language which stresses the need for improving the waste recycling program operated by the Architect of the Capitol. The language in the report makes clear that the Architect should contact each Member, committee, and staff office to elicit cooperation and compliance. It also stresses the importance of continued training of the Architect's workforce in implementing this program.

It should be noted that the House Recycling Program has been operating for 6 years now. A pilot test was done in 1990. The House-wide program was begun in 1993.

It should also be noted that the program has been producing results. Since 1993, 12,886 tons of House and Senate waste cans, bottles, and paper have been recycled. The Architect has estimated that we have avoided over \$900,000 (936,518) in landfill costs due to the recycling waste transferred to recycling contractors. Over the past 3 years, almost \$600,000 of cost avoidance is due to waste material collected and recycled from House offices, at a cost of \$378,000.

That's a 1.6 to 1 benefit/cost ratio. That is a benefit/cost ratio that indicates that recycling is paying off. It is saving taxpayer funds and is contributing to a cleaner environment.

We have also been told by the Architect of the Capitol that 1,977 tons of House trash and waste were recycled by our recycling contractor last year. That 1,977 tons represents about 57 percent of the waste stream generated by House offices.

The Office of Waste Management at the General Services Administration has informed us that GSA itself only recycles 30–35 percent of their waste stream. According to GSA, the Government-wide goal is 50 percent.

So, I would say to those who are concerned about the effort being made, there is a great deal being accomplished. And we are exceeding the Government-wide standard.

Recycling of House waste products is working, but like all similar programs, it requires monitoring and follow-up. We should strive to improve our record.

In that context, the subcommittee decided to include the report language. We have asked the Architect of the Capitol to renew his efforts and to enlist the cooperation of all House offices.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], deserves quite a bit of praise for this bill. This is a good bill, and it is a bill that was put together by the work that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] has done and the way in which he has treated the members of the committee.

He has been very fair to this ranking member, and he has been very fair to the members on our side. And for that, we thank him and we look, in spite of some present difficulties, to a future working relationship that will improve as time goes on.

I also would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our ranking member, for the work that he has done in support of my work on the commit-

tee, and also to thank the other members of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and a special thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who set a track record here in this House for this kind of work. Once again, I thank the gentleman.

And I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] for being the kind of person that he is and for the work that he has done on this committee.

□ 1745

Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of today's discussion is the fact that while this bill starts out as a good bill, outside problems, problems that do not belong really within the committee but then become part of the committee, have taken a hold of this process.

I am speaking specifically about the fact that the minority party feels very much that fairness is not being applied in the dealings with amendments not only on this committee but throughout the committees in the House and that a lack of civility has grown in the institution to the point where the minority party in no way on our side of the aisle feels that we are being treated fairly and properly.

In addition, on this particular bill, we asked for some amendments which were denied. They were amendments, in our opinion, that belong as part of this discussion, because they speak as to how the majority party is running the House and how some things are being done.

While some may argue that the amendments specifically do not speak to the bill, they certainly do speak to the running of the House, they speak to the way in which business is being conducted, and in that sense we have some very serious problems with those issues. We asked for those amendments to be presented.

We were very much concerned, for instance, with the fact that \$1.4 million is being spent on an investigation of organized labor in this country. We are concerned also with the fact that a Member of Congress who has been duly elected has been harassed and her campaign and her campaign results continue to be questioned. I speak about the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. It is improper, in our opinion, to continue to harass her and harass the results of her campaign.

We particularly feel very nervous about the fact and very concerned about the fact that in carrying out, as we feel, this harassment, that some people have been targeted throughout the country, namely Hispanic surname Americans, for special negative treatment.

We are also very much concerned about the fact that, in general, when we ask for amendments, amendments are either denied or they are rewritten by the Committee on Rules before they are presented in the House, and that is something that has been of great concern to us.

With that in mind, we will hear Members today on our side of the aisle speak about these issues, and it is with much displeasure that I once again inform my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], and I mean that sincerely, my friend, that it is not the intent of this side to vote for this bill when final passage comes.

There will be some amendments that we will deal with, we will try to make our point, but I am hoping that the gentleman from New York will continue to understand or at least try to understand, if he does not already, that this is a very difficult time in terms of the behavior of this House, and our side of the aisle is trying to very strongly make the point that this has to change, that it has to end, and that a new day has to be born in this House.

With that in mind, I once again commit myself to working with the gentleman from New York. I look forward to the day, pretty soon, when these issues are put aside and we continue to build on this work that he has put forth.

Mr. Chairman, let me close with this thought. When I had an opportunity in the Committee on Appropriations to either go back on the Education subcommittee or choose this subcommittee, I chose this one with the understanding that I personally have such respect for this institution that I do not have a problem in dealing with this particular bill year after year, that I do not have a problem in working with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] in building the institution up.

I am concerned that some of the issues we will discuss today are indeed targeting the work that we do, because if other parts of the House and other behavior are not being carried out properly, then it really does not matter how much we try to protect the institution, the institution will always be in danger and our ability to deal with each other and conduct business will be in danger. I look forward to this type of behavior coming to an end, and I look forward to the debate that we will have today.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we will soon entertain a number of amendments that were granted by the rule. I would just like to point out for the record that the rule is a modified closed rule. This is the traditional way that this rule has been structured for consideration of this bill.

As my colleagues might imagine, there are lots of opportunity for mischief on this bill. I think while we were in the minority, we certainly respected the majority's view of protecting the institution by using the rule process. We have tried to do exactly the same thing.

In the process of devising this rule, with the help of the chairman of the Committee on Rules who has been

very, very helpful, we allowed for four amendments, two from Republicans and two from Democrats. There were two very contentious amendments on each side, one Republican and one Democrat, that were not granted under the rule. I think that is about as fair as one could ask.

There are issues that swirl about the Congress that are not of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and my making. We have, I think, a very good relationship. We work very well together. Philosophically, we are not what one would call twins, but we do understand the need to protect the institution, and we are both trying to do that. So we are being affected by issues that are outside of the purview of our subcommittee.

I would ask that once everybody has their opportunity to make their case and to take their best shot and to vote for or against their amendment, that we could get a bipartisan vote on this bill. I think traditionally it is the majority's responsibility to deliver the votes on the legislative branch, but there has always been at least some semblance of bipartisanship on final passage of the bill. It strengthens our hand when we go to the Senate in the conference to make sure that we protect our side of this very important Capitol building.

I would end my comments right now by saying, let us have our debate, let us be as civil as we can with each other, and when it is all said and done, let us come together and vote bipartisanship for this bill.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill today because of the irresponsible way in which the Republican leadership has conducted itself.

I consider the three investigations that I am going to mention nothing more than partisan witch-hunts. This year, the Republican leadership is wasting millions of taxpayers' dollars on three separate investigations. These investigations are mean-spirited, duplicative, and wholly unnecessary. So far, they have absolutely nothing to show for their efforts.

I would like to begin with the Committee on House Oversight's investigation into the election of the gentleman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. The gentleman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] defeated incumbent Bob Dornan in an election that was certified by the Republican Secretary of State in California.

In spite of this, Mr. Dornan, who was defeated, can still command the will of the Republican Caucus and orchestrate a kangaroo court to investigate his loss. However, 9 months later, Bob Dornan still has not proven that he won. Instead, he intends to punish the gentleman from California [Ms.

SANCHEZ] under an avalanche of subpoenas and a mountain of legal bills, and no matter that the burden of proof to prove wrongdoing is on Bob Dornan as the accuser and he has failed again. Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership should stop using taxpayer money to harass the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] in order to satisfy Mr. Dornan's craving for revenge.

Turning to the second witch-hunt, we have the three-ring circus of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. In spite of the fact that there is a credible bipartisan investigation currently being conducted in the Senate, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is determined to go forward with an investigation that is being conducted so shabbily that high-level Republican staffers have resigned from the committee. To date, this investigation has cost American taxpayers over \$2 million and there has not been one hearing, not one deposition that has produced any result. That is \$2 million spent and, again, nothing to show for it.

Finally, now we have the third investigation. The House Republican leadership has decided to tap into the Speaker's slush fund and spend \$1.4 million on an investigation into the political activities of labor groups. For what, Mr. Chairman? For another political score to settle at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH]. I think from the different committees that I have served on and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, there is no more of an evenhandedness of the issues or of the bill. The gentleman will bend over backward to help.

I would like to address the last speaker's words on Mr. Dornan and the gentleman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. Many of us feel that the Sanchez-Dornan seat was stolen. I will be specific. I will give my colleagues a classic example.

In the city of San Diego, they had 5,000 new citizens sworn in. At that time, a gentleman from the Republican Party asked the INS if they could establish tables like they always have, but this was an extra large one and they were told no, that this was so large that they were not going to allow anyone to register new citizens in either party. The Republican Party went down there the day of, anyway, and there were 12 Democrat tables set up and no Republican tables had been allowed in.

Then we have the case of the pushing in of new citizens and waiving background checks to the point where we have thousands, thousands, of people that were let in as new citizens that were felons. I am not talking just little

felons, I am talking rapists, murderers, and so on. The recent newspaper articles on Conair, where they are actually shifting out people in different areas, is prevalent, also.

All Mr. Dornan is asking is to get the records to see if there was an injustice or if there were any peculiarities in that particular district that affected voting. That is a fair question: Do you have American citizens voting?

What they found to date, especially one activist group encouraged people that were going to be citizens to vote. Even though they had not become citizens, they had done so. It is a felony for people to register before they have become citizens, and there is a great number of those. At the same time, there were numbers of illegals that had registered.

What we need to do, Mr. Chairman, is to take a look at motor-voter, the practices of the INS, the practices of registration in different States. It is not just Mr. Dornan at stake. If we look at all of the border States and the infusion of illegals coming across, we even had hearings in San Diego that the Border Patrol stepped forward and said that they were ordered to let illegals come through, not us, not the Republicans, but the Border Patrol members themselves.

We need to get to the heart of this. When Mr. Dornan asks to have the records looked at by appropriate sources, by Republicans and Democrats, by the judicial system, I think that is fair.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a man who set the tone for me to follow, and it is very difficult.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I expressed my feelings on the rule on the issue that was just brought to us by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. But my reason for rising at this point is to separate myself from the debate on the overall behavior of the majority versus the minority in the institution, to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from the city of New York [Mr. SERRANO] for the excellent job that they have done in bringing the bill to this point.

As the chairman has indicated, we are obviously confronted with other issues when we come to the floor that sometimes transcend the work that is done in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and that is once again the case here. Members will feel differently about the vote on final passage today, perhaps based on factors that have influenced our thinking in the general manner in which the House is being administered. But I think that if we are not careful, we will overlook the fine work that has been done by these two gentlemen, and I hope all Members will pay attention to and honor the effort they have made getting us to this point.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the great frustrations here, of course, is that not only have we violated all the traditions of the House in the Sanchez case, changing the rules, having the committee kind of being the adversary for an elected Member of Congress, but we have focused in on a community that the majority Republican Party has made a serious effort trying to intimidate away from the polls. Not just in this instance, going as far back as races in New Jersey in the early 1980's, when we had polling security people show up trying to intimidate new Americans from voting.

□ 1800

The reality is we cannot use the Sanchez situation to try to review every piece of legislation on the books. We remember from when motor-voter was passed, the Republicans did not want to have poor people register. They wanted to keep it out of places where poor people went. They did not want to do it at welfare offices. We think everybody ought to vote. Frankly, I think it is too hard to get people in this country to vote. If someone is an American they ought to vote.

If there is something wrong with the Sanchez race, then under the law it is Mr. Dornan's responsibility to come forward and show that. He has come forward so many times with so many accusations, he just keeps stretching the process, and now the committee has taken over. First, he was worried about a house. There were 10 or 12 people living in that house, and I think they all had different last names. Yes; there were nuns living in that house. Then he found a second house that seemed awfully dangerous, and there were like 18 people living in that house; 1 address, 18 people, all different names. Lo and behold, it turned out to be a Marine barracks.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Dornan spent a lot of time on this floor talking about how tough he was, what a military campaigner he was. He ought to take this like an honorable politician. The evidence is clear. She won the race. Were there some problems? Yes. They do not measure up to her margin. If he has got proof, he ought to come forward with it. It is 9 months since the election. It starts to look like they are trying to drain her of resources and intimidate Hispanics from voting.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, following the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], some of my colleagues might be surprised to find out that I was an original

cosponsor of the motor-voter bill, and in fact we think it is a good idea to reach out and get as many people as we can on the rolls. But they fail to understand one fundamental point. Get all the people on the rolls who legally should be on, get all the people off who should not be on.

What we are doing now in Orange County, and the attorney for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] has finally admitted, there were people who voted in that contest who should not have voted. They were registered illegally, and they participated in the election illegally. The question is not if; the question is how many. We are in the process of determining how many. It is interesting that the minority already knows there were not enough to make a difference in the election.

What we try to do on our side of the aisle with the new majority is investigate the facts and then come to a conclusion rather than coming to a conclusion based upon what they want the end result to be. We are working with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It has been very difficult. We had to subpoena them to go through their records to provide us with the thousands of names. We will determine how many people voted illegally, not in an attempt to deal with this election, but in an attempt to get every American who casts a vote legally to have a comfort level that their vote would not have been canceled by someone who voted illegally.

We believe it is fundamental. We believe we have to get to the bottom of it. No amount of protesting on their side will deter us from making sure that every legal voter believes no illegal vote canceled them out.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what is being said here, over \$200,000 in funds provided by this bill is being committed to a witch hunt against one of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], for the sake of partisan games. This is an unprecedented attack which many of us believe has much more to do with the growing political power of Hispanics in this country. The committee has allowed a pattern of actions by both Mr. Dornan, the loser in that contest, and the committee itself which are an outrage to the Latino community.

The violation of privacy rights that people have a right to expect when they apply to the INS; that is why they had to subpoena them, to violate their privacy rights, and future voter intimidation and voter suppression of the Hispanic community are outrageous and will never be tolerated by us.

The voters of the 46th District of California elected the gentlewoman

from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] in an election certified by the Republican Secretary of State last November, uncontested in any California court. For the first time since 1969 Republicans forced a hearing on the merits, a procedure that is available here. That hearing, held in the district of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], was a media circus that produced no credible evidence of changing the election outcome.

Unprecedented subpoena powers have been given to Mr. Dornan, now a private citizen, to harass Hispanic Americans and organizations that have helped them, like Catholic Charities, 20,000 students at Rancho Santiago Community College and even, as Mr. Dornan admitted, the Carpenters Union. Why? Because they had a large contingent of immigrant workers.

Add to all of these facts the admissions that we have already heard here and by one of the senior Republican Committee on Appropriations members that the real reason for pursuing the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is to kill motor-voter, and we have a Republican plan that is crystal clear.

So what is that plan? Attack the underpinnings of Hispanic empowerment by attacking a Hispanic woman elected to Congress, give unprecedented subpoena powers to a private citizen to intimidate Hispanic individuals, violate their privacy rights at the INS, create fear in the community, and by doing so create a chilling effect on voters, thereby intimidating them and suppressing their enjoyment of the right to vote, and, as a by-product, let us create the base for getting rid of motor-voter.

And that reminds me of the Republican motivated ballot security program that happened in my State of New Jersey in 1980, which were brought to Federal Court, and we will do it again if we have to.

We should not permit the use of taxpayer funds for such a biased political witch hunt, we should not accept and we will not accept this treatment as a community. We are here to stay, and so is the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. Get it over with, stop wasting our money, and we should register a vote of protest on this bill.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. The Republican leadership is using the Committee on House Oversight, funded by this appropriation bill, to harass a Hispanic woman Member of Congress. Three hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money has been used to try to deny the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] the congressional seat that she won fair and square. And this is not just about the gentlewoman from California, this is about the growing influence, political influence, of

Latinos in this country. This is about sharing power.

As if that were not enough, the Republicans have forced the INS to launch an investigation against the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] without providing the funding to do so. They have literally given subpoena power to the loser in the race, Bob Dornan.

The Republicans are trying to say that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] did not win her seat fairly. There is only one problem. They cannot prove it. Instead, they are wasting taxpayers' money to harass a Member of Congress. It is outrageous, and it has got to stop.

Vote no on this bill.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to this debate. I had to rise because I am familiar with a lot of the facts with respect to the investigation as to illegal voters voting in the Sanchez-Dornan race, and this is not about the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], it is not about Bob Dornan; it is about a very simple American fundamental value that is known as one man or one woman and one vote, and that means that no matter where one comes from, no matter how long they have been in America, no matter whether they are rich or poor, they get one vote.

And there was an investigation in Orange County, and one organization that is supported by taxpayer dollars, by our dollars, registered to vote over 300 people who were not legal voters. That has been established. That is the basis for the ongoing investigation.

I think it does a disservice for people that come from all over the world to be Americans to somehow give them the idea that the system that they left, the system where the ballots are counted on Sunday before the Tuesday election, the ballots where some people get five votes and other people get no votes, is somehow something that should be pursued here.

Now one of the two candidates, Mr. Dornan or the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], got the most votes by legal voters in Orange County. The person who got the most votes wins. That is what this is about, and everybody who is involved in this is willing to let the chips fall where they may. If Ms. SANCHEZ when the smoke clears and the illegal votes have been taken away has the most votes, then she wins; if when the smoke clears the person who got the most votes on election day is Mr. Dornan, then he wins; and if it is unclear as to who wins, then we have a new election.

That is America, and I might say to my colleagues that is why people come to America. That is not bad, and that is not any kind of an insult to anybody. The Republicans do a lot of registering of new citizens, we have our card tables right there at the new citizens' swear-

ing in programs for Hispanic Americans, Filipino Americans, Vietnamese Americans after they become citizens.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] was certified the winner of the 1996 congressional election in California's 46th Congressional District by a Republican registrar of voters and the Republican secretary of State by 979 votes after a recount of every ballot. I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

The Republican leadership has spent 9 months and \$300,000 investigating the election of our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], and it is now time for this to stop. This is clearly a partisan attempt to steal an election that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] won fair and square.

I am sorry to break it to my Republican colleagues, but Bob Dornan lost the election and, yes, he even lost to a Democratic Hispanic woman. The Republicans have also given Bob Dornan, an average citizen, not a Member of the House of Representatives, the power to subpoena. He has used this authority to harass his political enemies by forcing them to spend thousands of dollars in legal bills to comply with his subpoena. Republicans are using taxpayer funds to finance a partisan political investigation. They are using race baiting tactics to scare new citizens from exercising their constitutional right to vote.

It is time to bring an end to this investigation. Let the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] do what she is doing very well in representing the people of California's 46th district. Let us get back to the business of the American people, let us call off this witch hunt on a partisan political basis, and finally, let us just stop wasting taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to this issue.

The gentleman from New Jersey earlier suggested that the contesting of an election such as this is unprecedented. Well, there is very strong precedent: the McIntyre case in Indiana. And nobody on this side suggested that that was an anti-Irish decision.

□ 1815

Let us try to stick to the issues. This really does not fall on this committee. This falls on another Committee. Let us try to keep this debate within the constraints of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, is a Member of this body. She has been seated. That is the rightful course of action.

Again, I want to point out, as I did last week, that I have had my disagree-

ments here when the Democrats were in charge, but when they were in charge and there was a contested election where a Republican was declared the victor, as the gentleman just mentioned, the Republican was not seated.

In fact, we are not in any way disrupting the right of the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, to act as a Member of Congress, but we owe it to the American people to see that that election was a fair election, and if it was not, if it was determined by illegal votes, it should be overturned. Otherwise, it is a crime against the American people.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are complaining that the contested election task force investigation is going on and has been dragging on too long. The fact is, this reflects something of a pattern.

What we see is, on the other side of the aisle and with the administration, a stalling, a stonewalling, and just dragging its feet. No matter how or what way they can do it, they are trying to elongate this, and then coming before the body complaining that we are putting the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, through a travail because it is lasting so long.

Mr. Chairman, this is pure politics. I, for one, would hope that we would not be calling each other names and then, especially, trying to suggest that the motives over here are malicious. We need to get to the bottom of this.

The task force is working. It is trying to determine how many votes were illegal. Already they have found 300 votes in the 46th district since the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, was seated that were improperly cast. The Secretary of State in California has determined that. The State registrar declared another 120 absentee ballots invalid. Together, that calls into question one-third of the 98-vote margin of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

However, with the INS dragging its feet and all the administration representatives out there not going along and trying to stonewall this, we now are faced with having to go through 5,000 votes that appear to be or there is a potential that these votes were cast by people who were not legally entitled to vote.

Mr. Chairman, this is, as the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, moves on, and we are not intimidating her, she is a Member of Congress, but it is just and right for us to determine whether that election was stolen, and if it was, she should be removed from that seat, because she did not win it.

A Democratic Party activist in Orange County was convicted several years ago, and I come from Orange County, of registering illegal aliens intentionally. He was arrested and convicted of that crime. We cannot have this going on.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think what some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have to try to understand is the process which has been used in dealing with this issue. No one argues with the fact that if one party feels aggrieved in any way, they can bring up an issue, and that is what we have the court system for and we have rules of the House.

But I can tell the Members that I have been on the short side of a couple of elections in my life where I thought there had been some problems on the other side, and there were different communities involved in that vote, not only different regions of a county, but certain different ethnic groups and political persuasions. I do not recall that anyone on my side ever suggested that the way to deal with this issue was to single out one particular group and to target those surnames and to go through the books and just make a mockery of the whole system.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that if you are a member of the Hispanic community and are involved in the political process, you know that for the last 25 or 30 years, 40 years, you have been working hard to try to get people registered to vote, to get people interested in the political system, and in the cases of immigrants, to get them to understand in this country you can participate and not be afraid that someone is going to do a number on you.

I do not think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle understand, and some may understand and not care, the chilling effect that this has on legitimate individuals who are here, who want to vote, who want to participate, and now are feeling that somehow, somehow they are being targeted.

Let me conclude by saying that I know this subject well. I know this area well. It is so difficult on the receiving end to have one community targeted, to have people's last names be the issue of the day, and not what in fact happened in the election. That is not the right way to do it.

What does that mean now, that every time there is an election throughout the country where there is a question, whatever your political persuasion is, that is the only group you are going to target? That could happen in all 50 States. That is not the proper way to do it. There are people on that side that know that is not the proper way. That is why we are making an issue of it today, because the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] has won. She should continue to sit here, and this investigation should come to an end.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friends that, as a member of the task force, I have followed this case very closely, quite obviously.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH],

who is inadvertently involved in this discussion, certainly he has none of the responsibility for the angst that is being discussed. First of all, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], who has left, he said this is pure politics. Let me say that it may be politics, but it is not pure.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] said that in the McIntyre-McCloskey case, which of course was not a Federal contested election case, that obviously is a sore point with many, and I understand that and do not mean to get into that, but the fact of the matter is, it was not. There was no question about the Irish vote. That is correct. The INS was not prepared to see if Irish perhaps had registered improperly.

That was not surprising, the McIntyre case, because by that time the Irish had been here in big numbers for a long time and very active in politics. As somebody who came into politics because of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I am thankful for that.

At no time in Boston did anybody ever go to the INS, in the 1920's or the 1930's or the 1940's, and say, we want the Irish checked through your records to see whether or not they are legally registered.

Mr. Chairman, in Providence, RI, into which the Italian community moved in great numbers, at no time in the 1920's or 1930's or 1940's did anybody repair to the INS and say, notwithstanding the fact of the machine politics of Boston or the machine politics of Providence or the machine politics of New York, when many Jews moved into the city of New York, at no time, I tell my friends, did anybody suggest that the INS check on every voter.

Notwithstanding the fact in Chicago, when the Polish community moved in, in great numbers, nobody, notwithstanding the fact that there were allegations repeatedly as to whether or not there was fair voting, asked the INS to check on every Polish citizen; no, I tell my friend, the gentleman from New York, this is unprecedented; not McIntyre, not Tunno versus Veysey, which was the first case under the Federal Contested Election Act.

And guess what, that was a case in which the Democratic majority said to a Democratic challenger of a Republican incumbent, no, you have not met the test, and we reject the Democratic challenge of the Republican incumbent, which we have done time and time and time again in seating Republicans who have been challenged by Democratic nonincumbents. Democrats rejected their claim and, in fact, never allowed their case to go as far as this one has.

So yes, I say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, this is historically a brand new and different attack. It is not an attack, frankly, being made by Mr. Dornan, per se, it is the committee that is pursuing this; also unusual, I tell my friend.

It is time to bring this matter to a close. It is time, and I say to my friend, if they have additional votes, 300, let us say, who is to say? At no time can anybody on this floor get up and say, I say to my friend from California, that those 300 votes were not equally divided, 150 for Dornan and 150 for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Why do I say that? Because uncontested testimony at the hearing was that the leader, Herman Dodd, said he was a friend and close to Bob Dornan and could not get involved in a campaign against Mr. Dornan; uncontested testimony. I do not know whether that is the fact. But I say to my friends, it is time to end this investigation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to become part of this dispute, but let me try to set the record straight, if the gentleman from New York will allow me, or both gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman, the INS is checking every voter in that election, not one particular group. They are checking every voter to see if they were naturalized and what the date of naturalization was, whether you are of German descent or Irish descent or whatever. They are checking everyone. They are not singling out any particular group. That is my understanding.

I say that because my subcommittee funds the INS. We have checked into this, I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. If it were otherwise, I would join the gentleman in his outrage. That is just not the case. They are checking every single voter in that election, and the naturalization date, and if you are a natural born citizen, of course, you would not show up.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. One of the problems, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman perhaps knows, is, first of all, the committee asked for all of Orange County, not just the 46th District, all of Orange County. That is where the 500,000 came from. So they have done a much broader search than would be called for by this contested election.

Mr. ROGERS. No single group is picked out.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

At first I thought this contest was about a difficult loss, Mr. Chairman. After all, Mr. Dornan served in the House for many years. But 9 months and \$300,000 later, no contested election has ever taken this long or gone this far in the history of this country. The gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, won the election fair

and square. The Latinos and other citizens of Orange County spoke, and there are some in this House who would like to silence them.

Mr. Chairman, the women and the Hispanics and the Democrats in this House will not tolerate the silencing of any man's or woman's vote. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] was absolutely correct when he said this has gone too far. It is time to end this investigation. It is undemocratic. Vote against this rule.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the levelheaded and very fair-minded gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], chairman of that House task force.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am the chairman of the task force investigating this election. I have to say that the comments I have heard from the other side of the aisle bear no resemblance whatsoever to the activity of the task force.

The point has been raised that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] won the election fair and square. We have not in any way said that she had cheated in the election. We are simply trying to determine if noncitizens voted in the election, and that would be illegal if they did. But we are not saying that she instigated this in any way whatsoever.

□ 1830

I also point out that my parents were immigrants. I grew up in an immigrant culture in a small town in Minnesota where a majority of people were immigrants. I would also point out that this Congress, the Republican majority, seated the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], which is a practice not followed by the Democrats in the case of a famous election in 1984 when they did not seat Mr. McIntyre and eventually denied him a seat on very poor grounds, and seated his opponent.

I would also point out that we have not delayed in determining this. We are working as rapidly as possible. The other task force on which I served in the previous session of Congress, that of Mr. Charlie Rose of North Carolina, did not resolve the issue until September of the following year. We certainly hope to resolve this one before that amount of time elapses. We are certainly not dilly-dallying on this one, or delaying, or conducting an investigation of a type that has not been done before.

A comment has been made that for the first time the committee has allowed subpoenas to be issued. We did not allow them. Mr. Dornan read the law and discovered that he could issue them. So he proceeded to issue them. It was a question raised in court by the Sanchez attorneys, and the court said: That is fine, Mr. Dornan can issue those subpoenas under the law.

We have not had any involvement with that activity. The only subpoenas issued by the committee have been those on the INS which unfortunately proved necessary because the INS was not willing to release its computer tapes to the committee without subpoenas. Fortunately they have been cooperating since that time.

As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has mentioned, we are checking all names, and my colleagues might be surprised at the results, since all the discussion here has been about those with Spanish surnames. The number of Vietnamese names is very, very large on the list in question, and other nationalities appear as well.

It appears that there may have been an organization in Orange County, which is why we are looking at all of Orange County, that deliberately encouraged noncitizens to register to vote. In other words, this organization may have been using noncitizens in citizenship classes and encouraging them to register to vote before they could legally do so. That is one area we are investigating.

The problem we have encountered is that subpoenas issued to that organization and to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and to other organizations have not been honored. They have not even responded to them. They refuse to give the information. The U.S. attorney has been asked to rule on that and has not yet done so. But it appears the only way we could get the information would be through committee subpoenas. We have not done that as yet, but we may be forced to.

This is not a new type of attacks as stated here. We are using the procedures under the act as it was written by this Congress and signed into law. We are simply using them properly for the first time in the history of the act. No one can accurately accuse us of subverting the process in any way.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Let me once again extend my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], even during this debate, for the gentlemanly way in which he conducts himself and treats the Members on this side of the aisle.

As I have said at the outset, it was difficult to stand up in opposition to this bill at first because of the fact that we understood well that outside issues had come into play. But as we listened to this debate, I think we can come to the conclusion that, while they may have started out as outside issues, they are in fact very much a part of this bill because this bill sets out to run the House, to pay the bills for the House, if you will. And when those bills are paid to harass people

and those bills are paid to bring pain on the institution, then I do not think it is improper to bring it up during this debate. So we have done so.

Let me just say that much of the discussion was around the Sanchez case. That is a very crucial case. It is not, in my opinion, crucial because it speaks about a seat in Congress, although I tell my colleagues I love my seat and I know how important that is. It is crucial because it speaks about a much broader issue. And it is the treatment of a community.

The last gentleman who spoke clearly said that other communities had been investigated but there are many people who feel that the target was specifically the Hispanic community that presents to some people a political threat.

Let me also tell my colleagues that I come from a district in the Bronx where at times we hear and deal with information regarding people who are not in this country with documents, as some would say, illegal. Well, the fact of life is that their behavior is one of hiding in the shadows of society, of never coming out in front. So the whole idea that people in large numbers were registered to vote to steal this election goes, runs contrary to everything we know about the behavior of people who are not citizens yet. Those people hide. We cannot get them sometimes into a clinic for help because they are afraid somehow somebody will find them out.

That is a fact of life. I do not know where all of a sudden this one county came up with the boldest of undocumented aliens who now want to be out front, sign up and be deported in the process.

This is not the way it is. My side will vote against this bill tonight, and we will hope that in the process we will discuss other issues which will make it easier for the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and I to present next year's bill and any changes thereof on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard an awful lot today about the contested race in southern California. That is an issue of obvious importance to many but it has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. Our responsibility, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and mine, and our subcommittee's and the Committee on Appropriations' is to provide the resources that this body needs to function. I think we have done that.

I think we have continued the trend toward cutting the budget, cutting expenses, reducing staff, working smarter, faster, better like American businesses have done to make them globally competitive. We have continued that trend. But our role ends there. We appropriate the funds to make sure that the legislative branch can do its

work. Then the legislative branch, the democratic process takes over. And the majority will prevail. In this case the majority will is to proceed with this task force. The minority digresses from that view. That is their right. They can say it as loud and as long as they like, but the fact is that when they were in the majority, their will prevailed and we expressed our reservations and they continued on their path.

The American public decided that this party would have the majority for these 2 years and they would have the minority, that those are the facts.

Our job today has nothing to do with that. It is to provide the resources needed for the legislative branch of Government. We have done that. We have done a good job, and it has been a bipartisan job and we should be proud of that. There is plenty in this bill for all of us to support.

Mr. Chairman, I will finish by just asking once again, reach across the aisle, ask the Democratic Members of the Congress to set the issues aside, once we have completed the work on this bill, and vote bipartisanly for support.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to register my strong opposition not only to the FY 98 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, H.R. 2209, but to the way in which the Leadership of this House continues to thwart progress and ignore fairness in order to advance a partisan agenda. This has resulted in the Democrats being effectively shut out of what had the potential to be a legislative session characterized by bipartisanship and productivity.

I am particularly angered at what I feel is an egregious waste of taxpayer money to fund investigative hearings designed to attack and intimidate organized labor. The Speaker of the House has access to nearly \$8 million, euphemistically referred to as the "Speaker's Reserve Fund," which is intended for use in case of emergency. Yet \$1.4 million of this slush fund was recently used to launch investigative hearings into labor activities, without the consultation of minority members of the House. I find this pattern of shutting out the minority to be entirely mean-spirited, petty and unfair to the American people, especially when it is their hard-earned tax dollars that are being used to advance these partisan goals. There is no excuse for circumventing the established and equitable procedures of the House, simply to avoid debate and discussion of issues that deserve, and indeed require, such serious consideration and bipartisan debate.

The Republican attack on labor, and on the minority members of this House, has gone too far, and I cannot support a bill to appropriate funds which will allow this type of partisan, unwarranted investigation to continue. It is certainly unfortunate that such considerations must continue to interfere with the business of the House, and I had held out great hope at the beginning of the appropriations process that we might be able to get our work done effectively, efficiently and fairly. It saddens me that this view has proven to be overly optimistic. I will therefore be forced to vote against this bill, and I must urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations included report language urging the Architect of the Capitol to conduct a feasibility study for the installation of adequate shower and locker facilities for congressional staff. Currently, there are only 14 shower heads for more than 7,000 employees.

The employees of the House of Representatives are one of the hardest working, most dedicated corps of staff I have had the pleasure to work with. House facilities are designed to cater to these long hours, with food service, banks, post offices, a barber shop and a beauty salon available within the House complex so that errands can be taken care of with minimal time away from work. Adequate facilities to accommodate those who wish to exercise during the day or bike or run to work are not perks—they are important in helping our employees become more efficient and effective and they could actually save us money. Encouraging our employees to bike to work or exercise has several benefits:

*Health and Productivity.*—Recent studies ranking adult physical activity levels in U.S. cities concluded that Washington, DC, has the highest per capita rate of sedentary adults in the country. At the same time, we are learning more every day about the importance of regular exercise and its impacts on overall health, productivity, and longevity. I know many of our fellow Members believe they are more effective when they exercise regularly—I see them every day in the Members' locker room.

*Time.*—How many people will sit in their cars this evening, stuck in traffic on their way to ride a stationary bike or run on a treadmill? Combining the daily commute with exercise is an effective way to work out without taking extra time from already full days. Riding, skating, or running to work can actually take less time than driving from some parts of the District. Showers would make it possible for staff to use these modes.

*Congestion.*—The Washington metro area has some of the most congested roadways in the country. Local traffic congestion may seem like an intractable problem, but by making it possible for our employees to ride or run to work, or at least to avoid that extra trip to the health club, we can do something to relieve traffic congestion.

A Harris Poll conducted in 1990 showed that 43.5 percent of bike riders would ride to work if trip-end facilities—showers, lockers, and bike parking—were available, and in my district, where a 1992 survey found that 21 percent of bike riders would be motivated to ride to work if they had showers and parking, response to these improvements is enthusiastic. Private companies and public agencies around the country are retrofitting their buildings with these facilities to accommodate their workers. We should acknowledge the wisdom of these companies and take up their example.

I look forward to working with the Office of the Architect to design this study, and again I thank the committee for their consideration.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998 cuts the funding level for the General Accounting Office by \$9 million from the fiscal year 1997 funding level. This cut is unwise and unfair and should be reversed in Conference.

Two years ago, the GAO and House and Senate Appropriators reached an agreement

on a two-year plan to reduce GAO's budget. As part of that agreement, GAO's budget has been reduced by 25 percent and its staffing has dropped below 3,500—its lowest level in almost 60 years. These cuts have taken a heavy toll. Hiring and promotions have been frozen for a long time. Staff reductions have diminished expertise in key areas. And needed investments in information technology have been placed on hold. Additional cuts now are not only a violation of that agreement, they will result in a loss of morale and a further loss in staff expertise as the agency's future is cast in doubt.

Instead of pursuing this foolish course of action, the House should have honored the agreement over funding for the GAO. It could easily have made up for the revenue difference by refusing to fund the Government Reform and Oversight's partisan witch-hunt into campaign fundraising practices. The budget for that "investigation" is an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money. The Senate is doing a better, and fairer, job while the House's investigation is in a shambles. We are wasting millions of dollars on a mistake-plagued House investigation which duplicates the more comprehensive and bipartisan efforts of the Senate. Instead of funding partisan investigations in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, let's give money to those that can really use it, the professional auditors and investigators of the GAO.

The Senate has also taken a much wiser approach to GAO's funding, and kept faith with the agreement reached two years ago. By funding GAO at their requested level, the Senate has provided less than a 2 percent increase; not enough for any staff or program increases, just enough to continue current operations at their present levels. In essence it is a cost of living increase. This is certainly the least Congress should provide for the GAO, our own investigative arm. The cuts in the House bill are penny wise and pound foolish because the GAO remains an excellent investment for the American taxpayer. The financial benefits from its work in the last five years alone total over \$103 billion.

If we in Congress are to continue doing our jobs well, we need a strong and effective General Accounting Office. I urge my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee to carefully consider these issues during the conference with the Senate on this bill.

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

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

The text of H.R. 2209 is as follows:

H.R. 2209

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$708,738,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$12,293,000, including: Office of the

Speaker, \$1,590,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,626,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,652,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$1,024,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$998,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$397,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$736,000; Republican Conference, \$1,172,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,277,000; Democratic Caucus, \$631,000; and nine minority employees, \$1,190,000.

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

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$379,789,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$86,268,000: *Provided*, That such amount (together with any amounts appropriated for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1997) shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 1998.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$18,276,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount (together with any amounts appropriated for such salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1997) shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 1998.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$84,356,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than \$3,500, of which not more than \$2,500 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, \$16,804,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not more than \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,564,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$50,727,000, including \$27,247,000 for salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Resources, of which \$23,210,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That of the amount provided for House Information Resources, \$8,253,000 shall be for net expenses of telecommunications: *Provided further*, That House Information Resources is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,808,000, of which \$1,000 shall be for the release of the Inspector General's Report on Management and Financial Irregularities—Office of the Chief Administrative Office: *Provided further*, That all names of persons making favorable

or unfavorable statements in the report shall be expunged; for the Office of the Chaplain, \$133,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,101,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,821,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,827,000; for salaries and expenses of the Corrections Calendar Office, \$791,000; and for other authorized employees, \$780,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$127,756,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$2,225,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$500,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$124,390,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, inter-parliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$641,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. The provisions of House Resolution 7, One Hundred Fifth Congress, agreed to January 7, 1997, establishing the Corrections Calendar Office, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto. The provisions of House Resolution 130, One Hundred Fifth Congress, agreed to April 24, 1997, providing a lump sum allowance for the Corrections Calendar Office, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 102. The funds and accounts specified in section 107(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 123b note) shall be treated as categories of allowances and expenses for purposes of section 101(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993 (2 U.S.C. 95b(a)).

SEC. 103. (a) Section 109(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 60o(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "who is separated from employment";

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "employee" the second place it appears and inserting "employee or for any other purpose"; and

(3) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "the amount" and inserting "in the case of a lump sum payment for the accrued annual leave of the employee, the amount".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1997.

SEC. 104. (a) Section 104(c)(2) of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 92(c)(2)) is amended by striking "in the District of Columbia".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1997.

SEC. 105. (a) Section 204(11)(A) of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (110 Stat. 1731) is amended by striking out "through 'respec-

tive Houses' and" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "through 'respective Houses' the second place it appears and".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of August 20, 1996.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$2,750,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$804,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$5,907,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (4) \$893,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the appropriations from which such expenses incurred for staff and equipment are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,266,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$70,955,000, of which \$34,118,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, and \$36,837,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for

extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$3,099,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1998 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 106. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1998 for the Capitol Police Board for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES" upon the approval of—

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

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

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

SEC. 107. (a)(1) The Capitol Police Board shall establish and maintain unified schedules of rates of basic pay for members and civilian employees of the Capitol Police which shall apply to both members and employees whose appointing authority is an officer of the Senate and members and employees whose appointing authority is an officer of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Capitol Police Board may, from time to time, adjust any schedule established under paragraph (1) to the extent that the Board determines appropriate to reflect changes in the cost of living and to maintain pay comparability.

(3) A schedule established or revised under paragraph (1) or (2) shall take effect only upon approval by the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(4) A schedule approved under paragraph (3) shall have the force and effect of law.

(b)(1) The Capitol Police Board shall prescribe, by regulation, a unified leave system for members and civilian employees of the Capitol Police which shall apply to both members and employees whose appointing authority is an officer of the Senate and members and employees whose appointing authority is an officer of the House of Representatives. The leave system shall include provisions for—

(A) annual leave, based on years of service;

(B) sick leave;

(C) administrative leave;

(D) leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.);

(E) leave without pay and leave with reduced pay, including provisions relating to contributions for benefits for any period of such leave;

(F) approval of all leave by the Chief or the designee of the Chief;

(G) the order in which categories of leave shall be used;

(H) use, accrual, and carryover rules and limitations, including rules and limitations for any period of active duty in the armed forces;

(I) advance of annual leave or sick leave after a member or civilian employee has used all such accrued leave;

(J) buy back of annual leave or sick leave used during an extended recovery period in

the case of an injury in the performance of duty;

(K) the use of accrued leave before termination of the employment as a member or civilian employee of the Capitol Police, with provision for lump sum payment for unused annual leave; and

(L) a leave sharing program.

(2) The leave system under this section may not provide for the accrual of either annual or sick leave for any period of leave without pay or leave with reduced pay.

(3) All provisions of the leave system established under this subsection shall be subject to the approval of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. All regulations approved under this subsection shall have the force and effect of law.

(c)(1) Upon the approval of the Capitol Police Board, a member or civilian employee of the Capitol Police who is separated from service, may be paid a lump sum payment for the accrued annual leave of the member or civilian employee.

(2) The lump sum payment under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall equal the pay the member or civilian employee would have received had such member or employee remained in the service until the expiration of the period of annual leave;

(B) shall be paid from amounts appropriated to the Capitol Police;

(C) shall be based on the rate of basic pay in effect with respect to the member or civilian employee on the last day of service of the member or civilian employee;

(D) shall not be calculated on the basis of extending the period of leave described under subparagraph (A) by any holiday occurring after the date of separation from service;

(E) shall be considered pay for taxation purposes only; and

(F) shall be paid only after the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board certifies the applicable period of leave to the Secretary of the Senate or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, as appropriate.

(3) A member or civilian employee of the Capitol Police who enters active duty in the armed forces may—

(A) receive a lump sum payment for accrued annual leave in accordance with this subsection, in addition to any pay or allowance payable from the armed forces; or

(B) elect to have the leave remain to the credit of such member or civilian employee until such member or civilian employee returns from active duty.

(4) The Capitol Police Board may prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection. No lump sum payment may be paid under this subsection until such regulations are approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives. All regulations approved under this subsection shall have the force and effect of law.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the appointing authority of any officer of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

#### CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

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

hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

#### STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$2,479,000.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not more than \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$24,797,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle.

#### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

##### CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

##### CAPITOL BUILDINGS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment, including not more than \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and for attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$36,827,000, of which \$6,450,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$4,991,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$37,181,000, of which \$8,082,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage,

and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$32,032,000, of which \$550,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1998.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$64,603,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

##### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$81,669,000, of which \$11,017,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Government Printing Office revolving fund under section 309 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1998".

#### TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

##### BOTANIC GARDEN

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a pas-

senger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$1,771,000.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$223,507,000, of which not more than \$7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1998, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,845,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

#### COPYRIGHT OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$34,361,000, of which not more than \$17,340,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1998 under 17 U.S.C. 708(d), and not more than \$5,086,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1998 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$22,426,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than \$2,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

##### BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$45,936,000, of which \$12,319,000 shall remain available until expended.

#### FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$4,178,000.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount of not more than \$194,290, of which \$58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 206. (a) For fiscal year 1998, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed \$97,490,000.

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

#### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

##### LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

##### STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$10,073,000, of which \$710,000 shall remain available until expended.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

##### OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository

and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$29,264,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$150,000: *Provided further*, That amounts of not more than \$2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for 1996 and 1997 to depository and other designated libraries.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than twelve passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,550 workyears: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not more than \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries; \$323,520,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,000,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1998: *Provided*

*further*, That an additional amount of \$4,404,000 shall be made available by transfer from funds previously deposited in the special account established pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 782: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office and remain available until expended, and not more than \$2,000,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1998: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 1998 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

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

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

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all

equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

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

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

SEC. 306. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104-1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 307. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed \$1,500.

SEC. 308. (a) Section 713(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "Senate," the following: "or the seal of the United States House of Representatives, or the seal of the United States Congress,".

(b) Section 713 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(d) Whoever, except as directed by the United States House of Representatives, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives on its behalf, knowingly uses, manufactures, reproduces, sells or purchases for resale, either separately or appended to any article manufactured or sold, any likeness of the seal of the United States House of Representatives, or any substantial part thereof, except for manufacture or sale of the article for the official use of the Government of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(e) Whoever, except as directed by the United States Congress, or the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly on its behalf, knowingly uses, manufactures, reproduces, sells or purchases for resale, either separately or appended to any article manufactured or sold, any likeness of the seal of the United States Congress, or any substantial part thereof, except for manufacture or sale of the article for the official use of the Government of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

(c) Section 713(f) of title 18, United States Code (as redesignated by subsection (b)(1)), is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a semicolon; and

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

"(3) in the case of the seal of the United States House of Representatives, upon complaint by the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and

"(4) in the case of the seal of the United States Congress, upon complaint by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly."

(d) The heading of section 713 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "and the seal of the United States Senate" and inserting the following: "the seal of the United States Senate, the seal of the United States House of Representatives, and the seal of the United States Congress".

(e) The table of sections for chapter 33 of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item relating to section 713 to read as follows:

"713. Use of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, the seals of the President and Vice President, the seal of the United States Senate, the seal of the United States House of Representatives, and the seal of the United States Congress."

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 105-202, which may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debated for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 105-202.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. DAVIS of Virginia:

Page 8, insert after line 5 the following new section:

SEC. 106. Section 104(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1987 (as incorporated by reference in section 101(j) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591) (2 U.S.C. 117e) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking "A donation" and inserting "Except as provided in paragraph (3), a donation";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A) In the case of computer-related equipment, during fiscal year 1998 the Chief Administrative Officer may donate directly

the equipment to a public elementary or secondary school of the District of Columbia without regard to whether the donation meets the requirements of the second sentence of paragraph (2), except that the total number of workstations donated as a result of this paragraph may not exceed 1,000.

"(B) In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'computer-related equipment' includes desktops, laptops, printers, file servers, and peripherals which are appropriate for use in public school education;

"(ii) the terms 'public elementary school' and 'public secondary school' have the meaning given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

"(iii) the term 'workstation' includes desktops and peripherals, file servers and peripherals, laptops and peripherals, printers and peripherals, and workstations and peripherals.

"(C) The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to issue regulations to carry out this paragraph."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is fairly simple and straightforward. The schools in our Nation's Capital are in a state of crisis. The dropout rate in the school system is over 40 percent. We have a very low percentage of these students going on to college. There are safety issues and management issues, but worst of all there is a technology revolution that is engulfing the beltway, creating thousands and thousands of jobs in the Metro D.C. area and the District of Columbia. And the students who come out of its public schools have not really been able to participate in a meaningful way in this revolution.

This amendment addresses this human tragedy by making surplus congressional information technology equipment available at no cost to the city's public elementary and secondary schools. Specifically the amendment would authorize the Chief Administrative Officer of the House to transfer surplus equipment without charge to the District of Columbia public school system during fiscal year 1998.

My amendment is limited to the District of Columbia schools because of the special responsibility that the Congress has to the residents of this Federal District under the Constitution. The Committee on Rules has made this in order. I hope my colleagues will support it. We have other Members who would like to address it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the Davis amendment?

Mr. SERRANO. I do, Mr. Chairman, not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] is recognized for 5 minutes and may proceed in support of the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think it is a wonderful amendment. I would like, however, if possible to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], if he would allow me to ask him a question. I am very much in favor of this notion and I am very much supportive of it. But, as we know, in the past I have discussed the possibility of Members being able to do this in their own districts. I would hope that we do this as a 1-year situation, which I support wholeheartedly and that next year the subcommittee look at possibilities, that Members in their own districts can accomplish what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] is accomplishing for the great city of Washington, DC.

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very good amendment. I think the gentleman's amendment has merit. I would certainly support it. I am delighted that in my role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative I am still able to reach back and help out my former constituents in the District of Columbia.

In response to the gentleman's question, this is something that we have talked about, that we both support the concept of allowing Members to use their used equipment in their district offices to provide to local school districts. I am sure the Committee on House Oversight would like to take a look at this before we appropriators try to make a determination, but I would certainly go with the gentleman from New York to the chairman and members of the House oversight subcommittee and urge that this be considered very strongly for next year.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for their generosity.

I do not think we have to look far to see the crying need for the gentleman's amendment. I especially appreciate that in his role as chairman of the D.C. committee he has looked far and wide and always dealt with the District in a bipartisan manner. I would like to make a suggestion to the ranking member because I can understand his concern as well. As to these computers in the District of Columbia, the cost of shipping will probably be more than the computers would be worth, but there are Federal agencies in all the large cities; and it seems to me the same kind of situation could be worked out with the Federal agencies in cities

like New York who would also have, it seems to me, excess technology equipment of this kind. It said that the District needs a billion dollars in school repairs.

In that respect, it is clear that we will not get to computers for an awfully long time. Bell Atlantic is wiring the schools of the District free. That will be done by April. General Becton in his budget this year asked for \$20 million for technology, and of course it had to be cut. The District came into compliance a year ahead of time, into balance a year ahead of time in order to qualify for the President's plan to relieve it of some State functions.

□ 1845

While the District is getting its act together, I do not think that the children should suffer. The Speaker has said that if we put a lap-top in the lap of every kid in the city, we would see changes, if not overnight, then very soon.

The gentleman from Virginia is clearly trying to get us close to that by at least putting a computer in every school. I thank him for it, and I urge this amendment be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

We can support this right now, for all States, for all congressional districts, but just in a little different way. The Century 21 high-technology bill, which is in the budget under Ways and Means, today the President is looking at it and he accepts some portions of that.

Right now he is insisting that all \$35 billion go toward higher postsecondary education. If that is the case, this will be cut out of all of our districts, and it is one in which we accommodate industry that develops and puts into the classrooms high-technology equipment like computers, like scientific gear.

The next phase of this, I think, should be the libraries, and we are asking for just a small portion of that \$35 billion goes through K through 12. We think when our education system in some areas, and we have good teachers, my wife is one of them, but in some areas needs help, that we do it in the K through 12 and not spend it all on post-secondary education.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I note there are over 19,000 high-technology jobs available right now that we cannot fill in the greater Washington area. This amendment, with a donation from the House of surplus computers, we have over 644 PC's available today, plus a number of printers, modems and other IT equipment, going to the school system, can

allow the city of Washington, DC, the District of Columbia and the students therein, to share in the economic benefits of this region and to allow them to be trained to fill some of these jobs.

I think it is a good amendment. I thank very much the chairman of the committee for allowing us to offer this, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], who has helped in arranging this as well, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

The District of Columbia public schools are in desperate need of information technology infrastructure in their classrooms. By supporting the Davis of Virginia amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill, scheduled for consideration this evening. Congress will allow hundreds of surplus computers, printers, modems, and other IT equipment to be donated to the D.C. public schools.

This amendment authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer [CAO] of the House to transfer surplus computer equipment to elementary and secondary D.C. public schools during fiscal year 1998. Current laws constrain the donation of surplus equipment, allowing disposal only through the General Services Administration [GSA] except for equipment with no recoverable value. The CAO estimates that there are hundreds of high end computers, printers, and modems currently available for use but not needed by the Congress or GSA. While the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper have successfully donated surplus computers and related equipment to the schools, the House lags far behind. To the thousands of D.C. students, 40 percent of whom are at risk of dropping out of school, this equipment correlates into more effective and dynamic learning opportunities.

The Congress has a unique constitutional relationship to the District of Columbia. Supporting the Davis amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill is a direct and efficient method that will inject much needed technology into the D.C. public schools. Speaker GINGRICH, Representatives MARK FOLEY, JOHN BOEHNER, and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON have all been extremely helpful in moving this concept forward.

I thank my colleague, for their support of this commonsense measure.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, as a long-time advocate of providing telecommunications services to our public classrooms, I rise in support of the Davis amendment. This amendment would allow the Chief Administrative Officer [CAO] of the House to transfer surplus computers, printers, modems, and other technological equipment to schools in the District of Columbia.

Many of the classrooms in the District are housed in buildings that are falling apart. Classrooms are ill-equipped with resources that will leave students behind in this rapidly evolving technological revolution. The Davis amendment would provide the District with an infusion of much-needed technology that will afford students the opportunity to succeed in this new, information age.

The statistics on the performance of students in the D.C. public schools are dismal. Only 22 percent of fourth-grade students in the D.C. public schools scored at or above basic reading achievement levels in 1994. Over the last 3 years, 53 percent of students

dropped out or left the school system after 10th grade. The cumulative grade point average for current 12th grade students is 1.5 on a 4.0 scale, and wide disparities exist in student performances among wards.

Information technology can excite young minds and provide all children in the District access to the same rich learning resources, regardless of where they live. Telecommunications would close the gap between the have and have-not communities within the District and help provide a level playing field for all students to utilize the information superhighway. In a nation rich in information, teachers, and students in the D.C. public schools can no longer rely on the skills of the industrial age.

I applaud Congressman DAVIS for his efforts to bring technology into D.C. classrooms in a direct and efficient manner, and I urge a "yes" vote on the Davis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 105-202.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FAZIO of California:

Page 8, line 18, strike "\$5,907,000" and insert "\$5,624,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of this amendment to freeze positions at the Joint Committee on Taxation.

My colleagues, I am sure, remember that the regular committee funding resolution managed by the Committee on House Oversight was a source of major contention this year. The dispute was not just because of Democratic objections but also because of Republican objections to proposed committee increases. Yet the funding assumption of that resolution was still a freeze on the number of committee positions, the Speaker's so-called employment caps.

The one exception, as I am sure many remember, was the proposed increase in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's allocation, and those increases provoked a significant fight here on the floor that I am sure we have already noted continues even up to this day.

Now the majority is trying to accomplish, I believe indirectly, what they could not accomplish directly, and that is increases in committee staff levels. The Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee originally went along with

the request by the Joint Committee on Taxation to increase its funding by 20 percent, a total of 12 positions, from 61 to 73 positions. But because of objections by Democrats on the committee, the bill was changed at the full Committee on Appropriations to add five positions to the Joint Committee on Taxation. My amendment would eliminate that increase and hold the Joint Committee on Taxation to the current year's staffing level of 61 positions.

The majority received significant credit at the beginning of this 104th Congress for reducing committee staff by one-third. It was a significant reduction, and one that we are reminded about constantly. In fact, we were reminded of it as recently as Friday's debate on the rule for this bill.

So one question is whether the Joint Committee on Taxation, which does not clear through the regular committee funding process for the standing committees of the House, will be singled out for special treatment while other committees with important jurisdictions and heavy workloads are given no increase in staffing.

I think it is also suspect that the Joint Committee on Taxation would make this extraordinary request for fiscal year 1998 funds but make it for the year after we are scheduled to complete consideration of major tax legislation. In fact, the buzz all over the Capitol tonight is that we have reached agreement on a major tax bill for the long haul. If that is the case, and I certainly anticipate it will occur this week, there is absolutely no way in which the Joint Committee on Taxation's increased staff will have any major tax bill before it in the near future.

The rationale given for significant new duties by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], in making his request to the committee, was for unfunded mandates and line item veto. It just does not hold water, Mr. Chairman. Those are responsibilities that are chiefly handled by the Congressional Budget Office.

Line item vetoes are far more likely to be applied to the appropriations bill. In fact, there is even a question as to whether it will apply to a tax bill. And unfunded mandates, as we know, are far more likely to be included in authorizing legislation.

In fact, the gentleman from Texas said, "If the Joint Committee's responsibilities are expanded in any further way, I will find it necessary to request an additional increase."

But perhaps the most important point is the highly politicized complexion that the Joint Committee on Taxation has assumed under Republican control, in sharp departure from its traditional low profile. The staff director, Kenneth Kies, was singled out for a profile in the Wall Street Journal that appeared in April. Here is a quote from that article:

"But Mr. Kies is breaking the mold, wielding his clout in some surprising

ways and taking all-expense-paid trips to speak to groups, many of which have large stakes in the tax code. Mr. Kies does not get paid for speaking, but last year he accepted more in travel expenses than any other congressional staffer," and this is what I think my colleagues are most interested in hearing, "more than any of the 535 Members of Congress, according to an analysis done by the Associated Press."

The Washington Post editorial a few days ago had this to say about the Joint Committee on Taxation: "The JCT was once the great redoubt of integrity in such matters. It has been converted into a political parrot." The New York Times, in an editorial about the 1995 budget bill said "Congress relied on misleading estimates by its tax analysts," and "The Republican distribution tables are distorted in at least four ways."

So adding positions to the Joint Committee on Taxation when its fairness is being called into question makes absolutely no sense. The simple fact is the Joint Committee on Taxation has not made a compelling case for these additional positions. They should not get special treatment.

Our precious committee resources should not be going to highly politicized staff operations that will merely be used to advance a partisan agenda here in the House instead of providing the nonpartisan estimates that we have come to expect in the past.

I think this is an opportunity for us to show that we are going to be fair across the board. I think it is an opportunity to indicate that we like people to work for us in these different and very essential committees who do not bring their own personal profile or who serve the House in a traditional manner, one that emphasizes the role of the Members and not of the staff in making policy.

I think we ought to treat this committee the same way we are treating most agencies, and that is give the existing staff a cost-of-living adjustment. That is what this amendment would allow; and, therefore, I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will eliminate the five additional staff positions that we have appropriated for the Joint Committee on Taxation. The chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], who also chairs the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, testified that he needed 12 new positions to do the additional work that was mandated on the Joint Committee's staff. The committee bill only allows five.

We removed seven of those positions during the full committee consideration of the bill, after the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Wisconsin and others raised this

issue. They felt that it was too large an increase at one time. That would have only, by the way, brought us up to the level where the Democratic majority had it when they lost control of the House, so we are still substantially below that level.

We offered an amendment not to eliminate the total increase but to reduce it to five. So we went more than halfway to show a reasonable approach to try to develop compromise. They wanted the whole loaf instead of half of the loaf.

The fact is the chairman of the House Ways and Means and the chairman of the Committee on Finance in the Senate both felt that this is essential to their work. The Joint Committee on Taxation does the very important work of providing technical support to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance.

As we know, this work is highly technical in nature and requires very high skills in tax law and economics. The staff is called upon to make several thousand revenue estimates each session for Members and those estimates are highly regarded.

In addition, the Joint Committee on Taxation has new responsibilities that staff resources are needed for: a new requirement imposed by the House to make dynamic scoring estimates in major tax legislation, to determine unfunded mandates contained in revenue legislation, and to determine limited tax benefits subject to the line item veto act. These are all new responsibilities.

With all due respect to the gentleman from California, under the rules of the House these are required of the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is their responsibility.

They also will have, we are told, the added responsibility of reviewing options for a comprehensive review of the Tax Code. What a monumental challenge that would be without additional staff.

There are many in this country who feel that the current Tax Code is unfair, it is antiquated, and it creates tremendous amounts of work and expense to individuals and to businesses. So many of us feel that there needs to be a review, and the Joint Committee on Taxation would have that responsibility.

The bill provides funding for a staff level of 66 employees, or FTEs. It puts the FTEs back to the level they were funded at in 1988. We are now working on the 1998 appropriations bill. We are asking for an increase to 66, and that is still seven positions below the level it was funded at by the Democrats in 1988.

So we are doing this added responsibility, doing it better, smarter, and faster. All we have done is to put them back where they were 10 years ago.

I heard the gentleman's concerns in the full committee and I offered an amendment that reduced the subcommittee's mark of 12 positions to 5. The Committee on Appropriations

heard the gentleman, considered the prudence of restraint, accepted a staff level of a decade ago and reported the bill with those limited resources. We have met the gentleman more than halfway.

I oppose the amendment and urge all to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman. If the gentleman would look at the transcript of the hearing on the Joint Committee on Taxation on February 13, the statement of the chairman of the Joint Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BILL ARCHER, makes no reference to dynamic scoring.

There is not any reference because, I believe, dynamic scoring is something that is still a controversial issue here, and I am not sure there is any mandate to the committee to handle that task. Dynamic scoring may, in fact, be what the committee needs additional staff for, but if we look at what was cited as the justification for the increase, I could not find it.

□ 1900

A lot of committees would like to go back to the staffing level they were at in the past. That is the very point I am trying to make. This committee is being given the opportunity to go back because suddenly it is determined that there is work for them to do. Well, there are many other committees that have additional work they would like to do, but they are not being given this kind of latitude, they are not being given this kind of assistance.

Also, part of my concern is I believe much of the help for this committee will be given to the Committee on Ways and Means staff. Certainly, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means benefit greatly from the work of the joint committee. But I am not sure that is going to be handed out in any 2-to-1 ratio. I am not sure it is going to be available to Democrats as much as to Republicans.

In fact, I think that the issue of dynamic scoring is something that is quite partisan within that committee in terms of how they would like to have the long-range effects of tax bills analyzed and factored into the way in which we project future deficits, for example.

So I think that the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], while certainly appreciated in a rebuttal sense, do not hold weight.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Just to clarify on this one point, under the rules of the House, this is rule XIII, paragraph (e)(1) of clause 7, regarding dynamic scoring:

A report from the Committee on Ways and Means on a bill or joint resolution designated by the majority leader (after consultation with the minority leader) as major tax legislation may include a dynamic estimate of the changes in Federal revenues expected to result from enactment of the legislation.

So, clearly, the rules of the House do provide that responsibility to the joint committee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. But before I do so, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say, the fact that it is cited in the rules and yet not mentioned by the chairman as a justification for additional staff is, perhaps, the point. It is not one of the reasons the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has asked for additional help.

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

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

The point of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] was that these responsibilities are not covered by the Rules of the House. Quite clearly, they are covered by the Rules of the House. Not to pick nits, but the responsibility is theirs. Thus, the need for additional staffing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] of the Committee on House Oversight, also a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] for yielding me the time.

I find it almost fascinating that the gentleman from California [Mr. Fazio], the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations is offering an amendment to allow no additional staff. The gentleman indicated that perhaps this particular committee could learn from what occurred to other committees.

Let me recite some dollars and cents and numbers for my colleagues. There is one committee in the House of Representatives that is not responsive to House Oversight and the rest of the Members in determining its budget. It is not the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is not the Committee on Ways and Means. It is not the Committee on Agriculture. It is not the Committee on Commerce. It happens to be the Committee on Appropriations. That committee alone determines its own staff and its own budget.

Let us return to 1994. The budget for Appropriations was \$14.7 million. The budget for the Committee on Ways and Means was \$8.1 million. The budget for the Joint Committee on Taxation is \$5.7 million. Let us leap ahead 4 years and look at the fiscal year 1998 budget of Appropriations, \$18.2 million. From \$14.7 million to \$18.2 million. That is a 25-percent increase in the budget that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], behind closed doors, determines what is appropriate to do their job.

The Committee on Ways and Means, at \$8.1 million in 1994. In 1998, it is \$5.5 million. In 1994, Ways and Means, \$8.1 million. In 1998, \$5.5 million. That is a decrease of 32 percent.

The new majority willingly took on themselves savings of taxpayers' dollars. The Joint Committee on Taxation goes from \$5.7 million to \$5.9 million. That is an increase. That is a 3-percent increase. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] focuses on staffing. In the 103d Congress, the Joint Committee, under Democratic leadership, had 77 staff. Currently there are 59.

On the Committee on Appropriations, there are 60 members. There are 155 staff; 52 of them are called associate staff. They get a staffer for virtually every member of the committee. The Committee on Ways and Means, we do not get that kind of staffing. We have to rely on the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Why is it called the Joint Committee on Taxation? Because that committee serves not only the 39 members of the Committee on Ways and Means, but it serves the 20 members of the Senate as well. There are 59 members who utilize the services of the Joint Committee on Taxation. Is it not interesting there are also 59 staffers? That means, on the Joint Committee on Taxation, there is one staffer for every member.

On the Committee on Appropriations, on the committee that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] believes should not get even five new staffers, the ratio for staffers is 2.6; 1.0 for the Joint Committee; 2.6 for Appropriations.

But frankly, the Joint Committee should not be compared to any committee here in the House. We have to go down and look at Treasury and we have to look at the Office of Management and Budget, because the Joint Committee is for Congress. The Office of Management and Budget, for the President, has 503 staff.

The Treasury, focusing on the issues that the Joint Committee focuses on, has 113. Get your translating dictionary. When they were in the majority, the staff was bipartisan. When they are in the minority, the staff is partisan. Understand, the Joint Committee works for all of us. They need five new staffers to do our work. Vote down the Fazio amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I really think it is not my place to protect or defend the majority on the Committee on Appropriations and the way in which they have allocated the funds. This is not a debate between the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations. This is a question of how much we should provide the Joint Committee on Taxation.

I know the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is proud of some of the reductions that have been made. But if we look at the Committee on

Government Reform or the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we see an increase from 1997 and 1998 of 26 percent for Government Reform and 22 percent for Education and the Workforce.

I guess the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] feels that a 20-percent increase that was originally intended for the Joint Committee on Taxation is consistent with those overwhelming increases in the staffing of those committees.

But I have confidence in the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO]. I do not think the Committee on Appropriations has been treated any better than any other committee. In fact, I think we set an example. And, so, I guess I rise to defend the majority from the majority.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, briefly, I rise as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and as the former principal tax staffer for the Senate Republicans in Pennsylvania in strong opposition to this amendment.

We have to realize that these revenue estimates that are done by the Joint Committee on Taxation are critical to our policymaking and critical for the minority and the majority. There have been 2,000 revenue requests per year heaped on the Joint Committee, and so far they only have the staff resources to process about 50 percent of them.

In the last 2 years, we have asked the Joint Committee to assume additional responsibilities in connection with the Line Item Veto Act and unfunded mandates legislation. We adopted a new House rule that requires the Joint Committee on Taxation to analyze the macroeconomic effects of such proposed legislation, and we have added additional responsibilities.

The lack of revenue estimates stifles tax policy, it reduces input from rank and file Members. Because, let us face it, members of the tax committee have, in all probability, easier access to revenue estimates from the Joint Committee.

Also, I think it is fair to say that this gives the minority a better shot at getting revenue estimates. Let us understand that revenue estimates are important and that a vote for this amendment by reducing access to revenue estimates is a vote against tax relief, in my view. And more importantly, it is also a vote against tax reform, which is something that I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will have an opportunity to take up during this Congress. It will require many revenue estimates because it is going to be extremely complicated.

In my view, if any Member of this body strongly supports tax reform, tax

simplification, streamlining our tax system, they should vote against this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] have the opportunity to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for yielding me the time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has made some very interesting points. But the one that touches me the most, for someone who just became the ranking member of this committee and who has been on the Committee on Appropriations for a shorter time than most members on that committee, is his understanding and my understanding that what we are trying to do here is, through the back door, increase a committee at the same time that we are sending out press releases talking about the fact that we are cutting staff.

And indeed, we are cutting staff in many committees. And, in fact, the whole House has felt the need at times to deal with this issue. And here we single out one committee, one committee that in our opinion has become a very political instrument to use in this House, not necessarily one that simply deals with the facts and figures; and we, through the back door, are trying to increase this committee.

Now, I know the difficulty that we face, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and I, in my case being supportive of his decisions to make some changes in the committee structure. But the fact of life is that no matter how we present this, there is no other way to present it but to admit the fact that this committee is being increased.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has made that point clearly. Anyone that votes against the Fazio amendment is in fact admitting to the fact that one committee was singled out for an increase, while other committees we gladly yell and scream are being cut. So we cannot have it both ways. We cannot cut an increase and then deny it.

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

How much time does remain, if I may ask?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] has 4¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will just say that our responsibility on the

subcommittee is to allocate resources. There are times when some committees have more responsibilities than others, and that is what we have tried to do. There was a request by the chairman, and this is unusual, too, because this is one of the rare places where the Senate and the House have to come to agreement on something that they mutually share. Both chairmen asked for this increase. We are going to provide that increase if the committee agrees.

So I would again urge defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I will just close and yield back any remaining time simply to say, if there was a justification based on a major tax bill, straining the resources of the Joint Tax Committee would have been in this fiscal year.

This is the year that we probably would find that committee spending long hours and putting in extra time trying to meet the needs of both the Senate and the House as we put together probably one of the largest tax bills we will see in this decade. But of course, this request comes in after the fact. It does not go into effect until the 1st of October.

But I think, in addition, we have to keep in mind the Joint Committee's stature here. The Senate has chosen not to make the kind of reductions in staffing that have been so prominently discussed ad nauseam in the House of Representatives. We did make sizable reductions, eliminating essentially a third of our staffing, most of which of course were majority staff of the former majority Democrats when the new majority took over. We understand that decision. We understand that it has been made. And I believe it should apply across the board.

It seems to me the people who need this committee from the other side of the Capitol are among those who need it least, because they have done absolutely nothing to track the reductions that have been made in this body.

So the joint committee is available, obviously, to the Committee on Ways and Means. It is an additional staffing assistance to them. And we understand why all those who come to the well today to defend this increase are on that committee. They will benefit.

□ 1915

But I think most of the other Members of the House on a bipartisan basis want to be standing tall for equal treatment, to make sure that all of the bodies that assist us in our analysis of legislation of all sorts are treated equally. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to defeat this increase in personnel and simply give the existing staff a cost of living adjustment.

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

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

First of all let me thank the gentleman from California for his stirring defense of not only the Committee on Appropriations, which I strongly endorse, but also his stirring defense of the majority. Any time I have him on my side in an argument, I feel pretty confident. However, on this amendment I do disagree substantively.

The House is about to enter into a major tax reduction agreement with the President, an historic agreement. This is something that was part of the Contract With America. This is something that we worked all the last 2 years and now 6 more months to come to. A capital gains tax cut, an estate tax cut, a \$500 per child tax cut for all Americans with children under 18. This is a monumental victory for all of us in this country. This is not the end of the tax cuts. If we have our say, this is only the beginning of tax cuts for the American public. We want to make sure that the Joint Committee can do a good job of determining what the impacts of these tax cuts are and help to lead the way, to show us the way toward further reducing the oppressive tax burden that has piled up on the American public over the last 40 years. What we are seeing is a major change of direction here by the legislature. We have seen the markets respond to it, we are seeing the deficit being reduced at an exorbitant clip. We are seeing the deficit estimates go down. Why? Because the country and the markets are responding to the Republican tax cuts. We want to make sure that we have the support of the Joint Tax Committee when we look at the next round of tax cuts in the next Congress.

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

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

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 105-202.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Klug:  
Page 29, line 13, strike "3,550 workyears" and insert "3,200 workyears".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and a Member opposed, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with the Government Printing Office which the Federal Government has actually run and the House of Representatives has been involved with since well before the Civil War in this country. Since the mid-1800's, we have been running a printing office. There are 100,000 private printers across the United States, all of them, I think, quite capable of doing the printing work now being done by the United States Government. If I ran the world, we would actually figure out a way to end the Government Printing Office and instead simply turn it into a procurement agency. But that is not the option in front of us today. What we are going to try to do is to further reduce the staffing levels at the Government Printing Office in order to at a minimum help the Government Printing Office operate in the black rather than in the red.

The General Accounting Office will tell us in a study ironically printed by the Government Printing Office that every time we print a document in the Government Printing Office it is roughly 2 times what it would cost us to do if we did it in the private sector. In 1991, the Government Printing Office lost \$1.2 million; in 1992 it lost \$5 million; in 1993 it lost \$14 million; in 1994 it lost \$21 million. We began to squeeze the Government Printing Office down about the time we took over the majority, and in 1995 the loss was \$3 million, but I have to tell my colleagues with some embarrassment this year it ballooned up to \$16.9 million, nearly \$17 million. This year through June of 1997 we are losing an additional \$4 million.

This amendment quite simply cuts the staffing at the Government Printing Office by less than 10 percent, about 350 slots. If my colleagues will do the arithmetic on that and translate it all out, 350 staffers at about \$50,000 a slot, when we include benefits, it results in savings to taxpayers at \$17,500,000, virtually equivalent to what the Government Printing Office is expected to lose in this current operating year.

I think in the long run we have to ask ourselves why it is that the Federal Government has been involved in the printing business for more than 130 years and especially today with web sites and Internet pages across the country beginning to replace hard documents and reliance on paper, the squeeze on the Government Printing Office I think will become even more extraordinary in the next several years, at a time when a single CD rom can replace hundreds of volumes of printed documents like the appropriations text that we are considering right now done by the Government Printing Office.

My amendment makes good sense because of changing technology, my amendment makes good sense for the taxpayers of the United States, and it

takes us one step further to where we want to be, I think, in the long run which is a government procurement office which uses the private sector and which saves money rather than a Government Printing Office which continues to run printing presses for the Federal Government in order to print government documents in an emergency, which as soon as I discover what a government emergency is, I will be glad to share it with my colleagues, and an operation at this point which loses unfortunately tens of millions of dollars a year for United States taxpayers.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me a letter that is being sent to all Members of the House in a bipartisan fashion by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS]. They clearly point to the fact that the Klug bill is not a good idea. In fact, the subcommittee had recommended a cut of 50 positions as part of the ongoing work that we are doing in the House. Yet this particular amendment goes way overboard in asking for 350 position cuts.

Let me just make one other quick comment. The gentleman did mention the fact that the web pages are opening all over the Nation. That is not reaching everyone. In fact, that is an issue for another day. But not everyone in this country and some communities are totally being left behind in this technology. To suggest that this is a way to reach them is totally improper at this time. I understand that the gentleman has a reputation for being one who likes to cut the budget and we applaud him at times for that. But I think this particular time he is making a drastic mistake and we should all join in defeating this amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, at this point let me suggest that it is not such a drastic cut, and to bolster the case let me yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment reduces the FTE staff level at the Government Printing Office from 3,550 to 3,200. GPO is currently staffed at a level of 3,600. This amendment will require a reduction in force. Even though the GPO continues to lose money at a rate of about \$1 million a month, their costs remain high. They tell us that is because they have to maintain a capability to do the daily job of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our hearings, bills, reports and other congressional documents.

The long-run solution to this problem is a rewrite of the printing statutes. The Government Printing Office needs to have their mission reevaluated. The Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch are using modern desk-top publishing technologies and withdrawing much of their work from the printing plant. The situation cries out for a more substantive solution than annual limitations on their workforce.

With that caveat, I will accept this amendment, but I want to stress that we need help from the authorizing committees on this matter. I know the chairman of that committee is dedicated to that task, and I want to work with him and others to bring it about.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, GPO, the Government Printing Office, has reduced their staff by 25 percent over the last 4 years, meaning a reduction of more than 1,000 full-time equivalents. The Klug amendment, although well intentioned, is extreme.

Time and time again Members searching for easy deficit reduction targets turn to Federal employees. Indeed, that is what this amendment does. Already the bill before us today will reduce the Government Printing Office by 50 full-time equivalents. The additional cuts contained in this amendment would reduce GPO by another 350 FTEs.

Such a draconian reduction would hinder their ability to produce the documents that we depend on in a timely fashion, including the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, bills, reports, hearing transcripts, official documents. Furthermore, such a large cut would lead to expensive RIFs; let us consider that.

Please join me in opposing this amendment. The GPO is making excellent progress moving into the 21st century with advanced technology and a leaner staff. Let us not set them back in time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not new. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers this amendment every year. This is his annual amendment of how we gut the GPO. Annually we say, "Oh, it's not going to be a problem." The fact of the matter is that this is an over 10 percent reduction. It is going to be approximately 50 plus 350, 400. It is going to require RIFs.

I regret that the chairman, somewhat in my opinion, cavalierly accepts this amendment. This is not a small cut. This is a cut on top of, as the gen-

tlewoman from Maryland indicated, 1,000 employees out of 4,500 employees over the last 4 years.

They are not dairy farmers. So if we no longer stop buying milk or have price supports or anything of that nature, who cares? But these people are going to be put out on the street. We have gone from 8,000 down to 3,600 in 20 years. We have done 25 percent of that in the last 4 years.

The fact of the matter is, if we want GPO to do something different, then let us pass legislation and mandate that. If we want them to be, I tell my chairman, financially solvent, then have the Congress pay its bills. Have the Congress pay fair market value for the product it gets from GPO and I guarantee that they will show a profit.

I ask my chairman to go over to GPO. They have as modern a capability in information technology as there is in Washington. Period. They are on line and on top of it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. This amendment, I will tell the chairman, will cost the government money. It costs approximately \$25,000 to \$35,000 per RIFed employee. This amendment will cost us, not save us. Reject the Klug amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. Let me wrap up this debate, if I could.

To my colleague from Maryland, let me point out to him that my farmers in Wisconsin actually would be delighted to eliminate the milk marketing orders because they discriminate against the upper Midwest. I would be more than willing to work with him on that in the future.

Let me make a few closing points. Here are a few facts about the Government Printing Office: Over 50 percent of idle machine hours; GPO operated and paid overtime on at least one weekend day of 50 of 52 weekends; paper waste average 40 percent higher than most industry standards, 1989 estimated waste totaled \$7 million.

Fact after fact, study after study tracing all the way back to 1989 through 1997 reaches one simple conclusion: The Government Printing Office continues to lose money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] is absolutely correct. We need to redefine the mission for the Government Printing Office, but in the interim we are going to lose \$17 million this year.

The long-run solution is to outsource the Government Printing Office and use the experts that are there today. The short-run solution is to begin to stop the bleeding and have the Government Printing Office break even in the current year operation. That is the intent of this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

□ 1930

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the Klug amendment. I believe it is ill-considered. The fact of

the matter is that GPO has been reducing its work force. Since 1993 they reduced by 25 percent, from 4,800 to 3,600. This year's appropriation request is for 3,500.

But the gentleman wants to go further, and in going further he would have us make 400 RIFs; that is, 400 people thrown out in the street, within about 65 days, and that will cost the Government money.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on something that the gentleman from New York said in accepting the amendment. He said the fact of the matter is we need to evaluate GPO. But rather than evaluate first and then make policy, the Klug amendment would make policy in the absence of any study, any evaluation, and just throw people out on the street.

If GPO's mission needs to be reevaluated, we have it within our power to do it. That is the responsible approach. This is a meat ax approach. It ignores the progress that GPO has already made in reducing its work force, and it does not make sound public policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a strenuous rejection of the Klug amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has expired.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 105-202.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 37, insert before line 1 the following new section:

SEC. 309. Any amount appropriated in this Act for "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances" shall be available only for fiscal year 1998. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] for his help in cosponsoring the legislation that we have turned into this amendment. Simply put, Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires unexpended congressional office funds from the salaries and expenses of Members representational account allowances not to be respent, not to be shifted into a Speaker's slush fund or spent on marble elevator floors, but to instead go directly to the U.S. Treasury to reduce the deficit.

Now we have been working on this for several years, Mr. Chairman. Last year we voice voted this amendment. The year before we had 403 Members, Democrats and Republicans, agree to pass this legislation. We think that this is fair.

In the context of this week we are debating maybe the most important legislation to balance the budget that we have considered in this body since the balanced budget amendment or since we balanced the budget in 1969. We are considering how to share and sacrifice to get to a balanced budget, and certainly that sharing and sacrificing should start here in the House of Representatives.

There are two reasons why my colleagues should support this Roemer-Camp amendment. One is that instead of this money going back to be respent, we have the money go to reduce the deficit. Second, this encourages better management in individual offices. If my colleagues decide not to do a number of newsletters, if my colleagues decide to implement a new management technique on buying office equipment and technology, if my colleagues come up with better ways to motivate their staff and they do not hire as many people in their district office, why should that money automatically be respent in somebody else's account? That money should go to reduce the deficit.

I encourage Members to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. ROEMER. I yield to the cosponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue and would associate myself with his remarks, and, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer-Camp amendment.

We all know the Federal Government is drowning in a sea of red ink. The Roemer-Camp amendment would help in a very small way at least to stem that tide. It would allow unspent office funds to be used specifically for deficit reduction.

As my fellow Members know, every office has provided funds to meet office expenses. The funds are not specific to each Member, but Members draw upon the account up to a certain level as needed.

This amendment would reaffirm our commitment to eliminating the Federal debt and send a strong message to the American people that we, too, are willing to sacrifice and to put our fiscal house in order.

If every Member saved only \$50,000 a year, over \$21 billion would be returned to the Treasury to reduce the Federal debt. This amount obviously will not eliminate the Federal debt, but it will show the American people that Congress will do more with less in order to provide our children with a future that is free of debt and rich with opportunity.

I urge a vote in favor of the Roemer-Camp amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I rise in support.

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, we have the gentleman's amendment. This is the same amendment we have carried for the past 2 years in the bill.

As we understand the amendment, it would require that any amount remaining in the Members' representational allowances account after all payments are made under such allowances be deposited in the Treasury for deficit reduction.

As the gentleman knows, the bill does not make representational allowances available to specific Members of the House. The calculation of how much each Member may spend for staff salaries, office expenses, and official mail is determined by law and is under the regulation of the Committee on House Oversight.

That committee notifies each Member of the allowance available for each session of Congress. The amounts available are not given to the Member. They do not receive a check or a funds transfer. They are only given an allowance to draw upon.

Likewise, the appropriations bill does not make a funds transfer to any Member. No MRA amount in this bill is assigned to any specific Member. The bill only provides an overall appropriation for the combined amount of the MRA's which may be charged against the Treasury.

And the committee bill does not full fund this amount. The bill contains \$379.8 million—\$379,789,000—for the sum total of MRA's during fiscal 1998. That amount is \$17 million below the total amount authorized to be spent by the Committee on House Oversight.

So the committee bill has already economized on this item. We know that many Members will underspend this allowance. We are saving the \$17 million.

This amendment says that what is left over after the end of the fiscal year will be deposited in the Treasury. That is true in concept but I would point out that these unspent funds never leave the Treasury to begin with.

Since this is a fiscal year appropriation, all unspent funds will lapse. That is, they will not be available to be spent after the conclusion of the fiscal year. So the terms of the bill meet the requirements of the amendment.

It is good to stipulate this fact and that is why I have no problem with this amendment.

So, with that understanding, I have no problem accepting this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the original sponsor and also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] for their persistence every year bringing this back up to the full House. We need their persistence out there. It is a great commonsense idea. I am delighted the gentleman has just accepted the amendment himself. It is a very commonsense idea to save the taxpayers a little money and also encourages Members to lead by example, and it is a very simple question really. When Members spend less on their office, should it go to this fund where it can be reprogrammed into other uses on Capitol Hill, which as I understand is a three-year fund, or should it go for deficit reduction?

As my colleagues know, the answer is quite simple. It actually should probably go pro rata to the constituents and taxpayers of the district the Member represents because they are the ones who in a sense have made the sacrifice. Because that is probably not too practical, at least at this point, then I guess it should go to deficit reduction and as soon as possible.

So I want to again commend both of these gentlemen for raising this issue again, for bringing to the floor and for a little common sense in our legislative appropriations bill this year.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], who has been very helpful with the legislation.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we have worked for many years in this institution to try to gain the credibility of the American people that when we talk about deficit reduction and when we take steps as Members to actually implement what we believe in that that effort is actually recognized in terms of what happens to this Nation's finances. And I would like to urge all Members to join with us in supporting this measure because indeed this measure allows us in the administration of our offices to actually implement what we are urging on the Government and the American people.

I urge all Members to support the Roemer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which

further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 2, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and Amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 213, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—199

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Allen	Frost	McNulty
Andrews	Furse	Meehan
Baesler	Gejdenson	Meek
Baldacci	Gephardt	Menendez
Barcia	Goode	Millender
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	McDonald
Becerra	Green	Miller (CA)
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Minge
Berman	Hall (OH)	Mink
Berry	Hall (TX)	Moakley
Bishop	Hamilton	Mollohan
Blagojevich	Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)
Blumenauer	Hefley	Murtha
Bonior	Hefner	Nadler
Borski	Hilliard	Neal
Boswell	Hinchev	Neumann
Boyd	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Holden	Obey
Brown (OH)	Hookey	Olver
Capps	Hoyer	Ortiz
Cardin	Hulshof	Owens
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Pascrell
Clay	(TX)	Pastor
Clayton	Jefferson	Paul
Clement	John	Payne
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Conyers	Kanjorski	Petri
Costello	Kaptur	Pickett
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
Cummings	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Danner	Kildee	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kind (WI)	Reyes
DeFazio	Klecza	Rivers
DeGette	Klink	Rodriguez
Delahunt	Kucinich	Roemer
DeLauro	LaFalce	Rothman
Dellums	Lampson	Roukema
Deutsch	Largent	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Royce
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Dixon	Lipinski	Sanders
Doggett	Lofgren	Sandlin
Dooley	Lowey	Sawyer
Doyle	Luther	Schaffer, Bob
Edwards	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Eshoo	Manton	Serrano
Etheridge	Markey	Sherman
Evans	Martinez	Sisisky
Farr	Mascara	Skaggs
Fattah	Matsui	Skelton
Fazio	McCarthy (MO)	Slaughter
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Smith, Adam
Flake	McGovern	Snyder
Foglietta	McHale	Stabenow
Ford	McIntyre	Stark

Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Thompson

Aderholt  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady  
Brown (CA)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Coble  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Foley  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (NJ)

Ackerman  
Boucher  
Forbes  
Gonzalez  
Harman  
Johnson (WI)  
Lantos  
McDermott

Thurman  
Tierney  
Turner  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters

NOES—213

Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Burton  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney

NOT VOTING—23

McInnis  
Metcalf  
Rush  
Sanchez  
Schiff  
Smith (MI)  
Spratt  
Thornberry

Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weygand  
Whitfield  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn

Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pappas  
Parker  
Paxon  
Pease  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Redmond  
Regula  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Traficant  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

Torres  
Towns  
Upton  
Wexler  
White  
Yates  
Young (AK)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 332, the Fazio amendment, I was delayed and unable to vote because my air flight was detained because of weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 332, I was delayed and unable to vote because my air flight was detained because of weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 197, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 242, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—170

Aderholt	Crane	Hoekstra
Archer	Crapo	Hostettler
Armey	Cunningham	Houghton
Bachus	Deal	Hulshof
Ballenger	DeLay	Hutchinson
Barr	Doolittle	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	Inglis
Bass	Duncan	Istook
Bereuter	Dunn	Jones
Bilbray	Ehlers	Kaptur
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Kasich
Blagojevich	Emerson	Kelly
Bliley	English	Kim
Blunt	Ensign	King (NY)
Boehner	Everett	Kingston
Bonilla	Ewing	Klug
Boswell	Fawell	Kolbe
Brady	Foley	LaHood
Bryant	Fowler	Largent
Burr	Fox	Latham
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Buyer	Ganske	Leach
Callahan	Gekas	Linder
Camp	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Campbell	Goode	Luther
Cannon	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Castle	Goodling	McCarthy (NY)
Chabot	Goss	McCollum
Chambliss	Granger	McIntosh
Chenoweth	Hall (TX)	Meehan
Christensen	Hansen	Mica
Coble	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Collins	Hayworth	Myrick
Combest	Hefley	Nethercutt
Condit	Herger	Neumann
Cooksey	Hill	Norwood
Cox	Hilleary	Nussle

□ 1958

Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. BATEMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Oxley	Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Waxman	Wicker	Wynn
Pappas	Roukema	Stearns	Weldon (FL)	Wise	Young (FL)
Parker	Royce	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)	Wolf	
Paul	Ryun	Strickland	Weygand	Woolsey	
Paxon	Salmon	Stump			
Pease	Sanford	Sununu			
Peterson (MN)	Scarborough	Talent	Ackerman	Metcalf	Towns
Peterson (PA)	Schaefer, Dan	Taylor (MS)	Boucher	Portman	Upton
Petri	Schaffer, Bob	Taylor (NC)	Forbes	Rush	Wexler
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Thomas	Gonzalez	Sanchez	White
Pitts	Sessions	Thune	Harman	Schiff	Yates
Porter	Shadegg	Tiahrt	Lantos	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Shays	Turner	McDermott	Thornberry	
Quinn	Shimkus	Walsh	McInnis	Torres	
Ramstad	Smith (OR)	Wamp			
Riggs	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)			
Riley	Smith, Linda	Weller			
Rogan	Snowbarger	Whitfield			
Rohrabacher	Solomon				

## NOES—242

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Mink
Allen	Gilchrest	Moakley
Andrews	Gillmor	Molinari
Baesler	Gilman	Mollohan
Baker	Gordon	Moran (KS)
Baldacci	Graham	Moran (VA)
Barcia	Green	Morella
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Murtha
Bartlett	Gutierrez	Nadler
Barton	Gutknecht	Neal
Bateman	Hall (OH)	Ney
Becerra	Hamilton	Northup
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Berman	Hefner	Obey
Berry	Hilliard	Olver
Bishop	Hinchey	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Owens
Boehlert	Hobson	Packard
Bonior	Holden	Pallone
Bono	Hooley	Pascrell
Borski	Horn	Pastor
Boyd	Hoyer	Payne
Brown (CA)	Hunter	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Bunning	(TX)	Pomeroy
Calvert	Jefferson	Poshard
Canady	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Capps	John	Radanovich
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Carson	Johnson (WI)	Rangel
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Redmond
Clayton	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Clement	Kanjorski	Reyes
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rodriguez
Cook	Kennelly	Roemer
Costello	Kildee	Rogers
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Cubin	Klecicka	Sabo
Cummings	Klink	Sanders
Danner	Knollenberg	Sandlin
Davis (FL)	Kucinich	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	LaFalce	Saxton
Davis (VA)	Lampson	Schumer
DeFazio	LaTourette	Scott
DeGette	Levin	Serrano
Delahunt	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Dellums	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sisisky
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Skaggs
Dickey	Lofgren	Skeen
Dicks	Lowey	Skelton
Dingell	Lucas	Slaughter
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Smith, Adam
Dooley	Manton	Snyder
Doyle	Markey	Spence
Edwards	Martinez	Spratt
Engel	Mascara	Stabenow
Eshoo	Matsui	Stark
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Stokes
Evans	McCrery	Stupak
Farr	McDade	Tanner
Fattah	McGovern	Tauscher
Fazio	McHale	Tauzin
Filner	McHugh	Thompson
Flake	McIntyre	Thurman
Foglietta	McKeon	Tierney
Ford	McKinney	Traficant
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Velazquez
Frelinghuysen	Meek	Vento
Frost	Menendez	Visclosky
Furse	Millender	Waters
Galleghy	McDonald	Watkins
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEJDENSON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2209 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House with an amendment to ensure that all funds in the bill to support the Reserve Fund providing for the hiring of additional committee staff and other related expenses pursuant to clause 5(a) of rule XI are deleted.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that if we look at the issues that have brought tension to this House and this Congress, this issue is clearly among the most important.

I would like Members of the minority and the majority to take a look at the history of how we got here. Pursuant to the rules of the House, the reserve fund was established of \$7.9 million. At that time I referenced this reserve fund as a slush fund. A number of Members on the Republican side of the aisle objected.

In section 5(a) of the reserve fund it was established for unanticipated expenses. Well, the request from the committee, the first request was to review the Department of Labor and its programs, activities, and spending habits. They got some of the slush fund money.

The original jurisdiction of the committee was to review those very same programs, the Department of Labor, its programs, and its activities. It was also requested to review the focus of the program which had little past review in terms of impact on employees and employers. That was also the original description of the committee's \$10 million worth of funding. So now if this is not a slush fund in the worst of its connotations for purely political purposes, the committee would have come up with some unanticipated challenges, some new scope where they had to go in and review a situation that was not anticipated, that was not able to be covered in their \$10 million.

What we found was very anticipated concerns were immediately used to get additional funding into this committee. It is a slush fund. If Members want to make things a little better here, let us have a chance to give some money back to the voters. Let us cut the \$7.9 million.

If the committees have a legitimate need, let them come to the Congress of the United States and in front of the American people ask for that money. The Republican majority has in the range of \$50 million worth of investigations going on. I dare say not one American will be better off as a result of these investigations.

□ 2015

The taxpayers will simply lose some of their funds and we will not gain new information or, indeed, information on issues that were unanticipated.

It is a \$7.9 million slush fund used for political agendas, and they cannot come to this Congress and tell us that

## NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Metcalf	Towns
Boucher	Portman	Upton
Forbes	Rush	Wexler
Thomas	Sanchez	White
Harman	Schiff	Yates
Lantos	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
McDermott	Thornberry	
McInnis	Torres	

□ 2007

Ms. DANNER, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. HASTERT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 333, my air flight was detained because of weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, because I was unavoidably detained, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 333. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, sadly a number of us sat on an airplane for 6 hours in Detroit. We unfortunately missed two previous votes today. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on both the Klug amendment as well as the Fazio amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 197, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, I am, in its current form.

they are trying to run it better when they failed in almost every category and now, in the utmost political venture on this floor, they have established an almost \$8 million fund to be used to go after those who have stood up to them.

Where do they start? They start with labor, with working men and women. They take some of that slush fund and they are going to try to go after them. The question is, if we allow them to continue with this kind of slush fund, which group of Americans will be next? Who will they try to intimidate with this \$8 million fund, investigating citizens of this country who have every right to exercise their own political activity?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I go to the words of the committee and the rules of the House. "Unanticipated expenditures." Nothing in the expenditures that have been taken from this slush fund were unanticipated. It is simply a political attack on the adversaries of the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can just get 10 Republicans to join us to put an end to this slush fund. There are people on the other side of the aisle that say they want comity, they went to Hershey trying to make friendship. Friendship is designed by peoples' actions. Vote for this motion to recommit. Get rid of the \$7.8 million, \$7.9 million, save the taxpayers' money and start building a trusting relationship in this House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. This motion is tantamount to killing this bill. It sends the bill back to committee, it eliminates all the work that the subcommittee, full committee and this House has done to this point, and I strenuously oppose any restrictions on the use of the reserve fund.

Mr. Speaker, just because it is said loudly, does not mean it is true. This amendment would repeal an action taken earlier this year in the committee funding resolution. The House has worked its will on this issue. It does not belong in debate on the legislative appropriations bill.

The reserve fund is designed to provide funding flexibility to take care of the unanticipated expenses that may arise during the 2-year term of this Congress. The committee funding resolution is a 2-year funding bill. And I think that in any project to have some unanticipated expense funds available is a very proper thing to do.

The reserve fund is a separate and distinct fund. All expenditures will be detailed explicitly to the taxpayer. This is a role for the Committee on House Oversight which has been adopted by recorded vote in the House and is consistent with the rules of the House. I oppose any attempt to limit the ability of the committees of the House to do their routine oversight work. I strongly oppose the motion, and I strongly urge its defeat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Without objection, the previous

question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I inquire, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it was stated that if the motion carries it kills the bill, and it is my understanding that it only sends it back. My inquiry is, it is my understanding under the rules it does not kill the bill, it simply sends it back to committee to take that particular action and return to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman the bill would be recommitted to committee.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 198, nays 220, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—198

Abercrombie	Fazio	Manton
Allen	Filner	Markey
Andrews	Flake	Martinez
Baessler	Foglietta	Mascara
Baldacci	Ford	Matsui
Barcia	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)
Barrett (WI)	Frost	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Furse	McGovern
Bentsen	Gejdenson	McHale
Berman	Gephardt	McIntyre
Berry	Goode	McKinney
Bishop	Gordon	McNulty
Blagojevich	Green	Meehan
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Meek
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Menendez
Borski	Hall (TX)	Millender-
Boswell	Hamilton	McDonald
Boyd	Harman	Miller (CA)
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Mink
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Moakley
Capps	Hinchey	Mollohan
Cardin	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Carson	Holden	Murtha
Clay	Hooley	Nadler
Clayton	Hoyer	Neal
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Condit	(TX)	Olver
Conyers	Jefferson	Ortiz
Costello	John	Owens
Coyne	Johnson (WI)	Pallone
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Cummings	Kanjorski	Pastor
Danner	Kaptur	Payne
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kennelly	Pickett
DeGette	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeLaunt	Kilpatrick	Poshard
DeLauro	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Dellums	King (NY)	Quinn
Deutsch	Klecza	Rahall
Dicks	Klink	Rangel
Dingell	Kucinich	Reyes
Dixon	LaFalce	Rivers
Doggett	Lampson	Rodriguez
Dooley	Lantos	Roemer
Doyle	Levin	Rothman
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lipinski	Sabo
Eshoo	Lofgren	Sanders
Etheridge	Lowe	Sandlin
Evans	Luther	Sawyer
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Scott

Serrano  
Sherman  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith, Adam  
Snyder  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark

Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Turner

Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weygand  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn

NAYS—220

Aderholt  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Goode  
Combest  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Foley  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallely  
Ganske  
Gekas

Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
McCollum  
McCreary  
McDade  
McHugh  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard

Pappas  
Parker  
Paul  
Paxon  
Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Redmond  
Regula  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Traficant  
Upton  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman  
Boucher  
Forbes  
Gonzalez  
McDermott  
McInnis

Metcalf  
Rush  
Sanchez  
Schiff  
Torres  
Towns

Wexler  
Yates  
Young (AK)

□ 2036

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 214, nays 203, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Gibbons	Pappas
Archer	Gilchrest	Parker
Army	Gillmor	Paxon
Bachus	Gilman	Pease
Baker	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Goodling	Petri
Barr	Goss	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pitts
Bartlett	Granger	Pombo
Barton	Greenwood	Porter
Bass	Gutknecht	Portman
Bateman	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastert	Quinn
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Ramstad
Bliley	Hefley	Redmond
Blunt	Herger	Regula
Boehlert	Hilleary	Riggs
Boehner	Hobson	Riley
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogan
Bono	Horn	Rogers
Brady	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hutchinson	Roukema
Burr	Hyde	Royce
Burton	Inglis	Ryun
Buyer	Istook	Salmon
Callahan	Jenkins	Saxton
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Campbell	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Canady	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Kelly	Sessions
Castle	Kim	Shadegg
Chabot	King (NY)	Shaw
Chambliss	Kingston	Shays
Chenoweth	Klug	Shimkus
Christensen	Knollenberg	Shuster
Coble	Kolbe	Skeen
Collins	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Combest	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Latham	Smith (OR)
Cooksey	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Cox	Lazio	Snowbarger
Crane	Leach	Solomon
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Cunningham	Linder	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Stump
Deal	LoBiondo	Sununu
DeLay	Lucas	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Tauzin
Dickey	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McCrery	Thomas
Dreier	McDade	Thornberry
Duncan	McHugh	Thune
Dunn	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McKeon	Traficant
Ehrlich	Mica	Upton
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Walsh
English	Molinari	Wamp
Everett	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Ewing	Morella	Watts (OK)
Fawell	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Neumann	Weller
Fox	Ney	Whitfield
Franks (NJ)	Northup	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Wolf
Gallely	Nussle	Young (FL)
Ganske	Oxley	
Gekas	Packard	

NAYS—203

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Boswell
Allen	Berman	Boyd
Andrews	Berry	Brown (CA)
Baesler	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Blumenauer	Capps
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Cardin
Becerra	Borski	Carson

Clay	Hulshof	Pascrell
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Clement	Jackson-Lee	Paul
Clyburn	(TX)	Payne
Coburn	Jefferson	Pelosi
Condit	John	Peterson (MN)
Conyers	Johnson (WI)	Pickett
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Coyne	Kanjorski	Poshard
Cramer	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Rivers
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Delahunt	Kleccka	Rothman
DeLauro	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Kucinich	Rush
Deutsch	LaFalce	Sabo
Dicks	Lampson	Sanders
Dingell	Lantos	Sandlin
Dixon	Levin	Sanford
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Dooley	Lipinski	Schumer
Doyle	Lofgren	Scott
Edwards	Lowey	Serrano
Engel	Luther	Sherman
Ensign	Maloney (CT)	Sisisky
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Skaggs
Etheridge	Manton	Skelton
Evans	Markey	Slaughter
Farr	Martinez	Smith, Adam
Fattah	Mascara	Smith, Linda
Fazio	Matsui	Snyder
Filner	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Flake	McCarthy (NY)	Stabenow
Foglietta	McGovern	Stark
Ford	McHale	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Stokes
Frost	McKinney	Strickland
Furse	McNulty	Stupak
Gejdenson	Meehan	Tanner
Gephardt	Menendez	Tauscher
Goode	Millender-	Taylor (MS)
Gordon	McDonald	Thompson
Green	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Gutierrez	Minge	Tierney
Hall (OH)	Mink	Turner
Hall (TX)	Moakley	Velazquez
Hamilton	Mollohan	Vento
Harman	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Waters
Hefner	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Hill	Neal	Waxman
Hilliard	Oberstar	Weygand
Hinchey	Obey	Wise
Hinojosa	Olver	Woolsey
Holden	Ortiz	Wynn
Hoolley	Owens	
Hoyer	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	McInnis	Towns
Boucher	Meek	Wexler
Forbes	Metcalfe	White
Gonzalez	Sanchez	Yates
Houghton	Schiff	Young (AK)
McDermott	Torres	

□ 2054

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule X the Chair announces the following modification to the conference appointment to the bill, H.R. 1119:

Mr. MCKEON is added to the panel from the Committee on National Security to follow Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

The first proviso to the panel from the Committee on Resources is stricken.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

**REPORT ON POLICY ON PROTECTION OF NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AGAINST STRATEGIC ATTACK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) 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 National Security:

*To the Congress of the United States:*  
Pursuant to section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, attached is a report, with attachments, covering Policy on Protection of National Information Infrastructure Against Strategic Attack.  
WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1997.

□ 2100

**SPECIAL ORDERS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). 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.

**CALLING ON HCFA TO STOP RESTRICTING USE OF MULTIDEX BY DENYING REIMBURSEMENT WHEN IT IS USED**

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, every year 54,000 Americans lose a foot or a leg to diabetes. As terrible as this is, one thing that makes this statistic especially heartbreaking is that many thousands of these amputations could have been prevented were it not for Federal redtape. Two-thirds of all amputations in diabetic patients are precipitated by traumatic foot ulceration, which could have been prevented with proper care and modern medical products that are already available.

However, Federal bureaucrats at the Health Care Financing Administration, HCFA, are restricting FDA-approved dressings which have been proven to heal these types of wounds. If this is not a scandal, I do not know what is, people who are having amputations thanks to our own Federal bureaucracy.

Just think how wonderful it will be if we could prevent up to two-thirds of these 54,000 diabetic amputations each year. Sadly, it seems that the Medicare system sometimes gives little or no incentives to doctors, nursing homes, or hospitals to help their patients get better quickly because as long as they are