



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2000

No. 80

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 22, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. C. Frederick Horbach, Memorial Presbyterian Church, Vineland, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, by whom alone all exists, through whom alone we all are sustained, in whom alone we all must seek direction and find purpose.

We confess that we are a Nation in progress, ever seeking to fulfill a divine mandate to establish liberty and justice for all the people. As such, we need Your guiding hand along the way of our pilgrimage. Look with favor, we pray, upon this our Nation and grant Your blessing for the journey.

Equip, O Lord, the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and all others in authority with uncommon wisdom, unwavering courage and unflinching dedication to seek, to know, and to do Your will.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that 1-minute will be conducted at the close of business today, but for the purposes of an introduction, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. C. FREDERICK HORBACH

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity and the honor today to welcome Dr. C. Frederick Horbach of Elmer, New Jersey, as our guest chaplain.

An ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Horbach has served at churches in Audubon, Elmer and Burlington, New Jersey. An educator, he recently retired after a 28-year tenure with the Cumberland County College where he taught courses in religion, art and philosophy. He is currently pastor of the Memorial Presbyterian Church in my hometown of Vineland, New Jersey.

Having earned an A.B. degree from Elizabeth Town College, a master's of divinity degree from the Princeton Theological Seminary, a master's of sacred theology and a Ph.D. for his research in art and religion from Temple

University, Dr. Horbach's knowledge and background in theology is vast.

His parishioners, however, will tell you that his greatest attributes are the interest, compassion and dedication he brings to his work. I am pleased that he and members of his family are able to join us today and would like to thank the House for this opportunity to recognize his many achievements.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4516, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 530 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 530

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendments under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4929

shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 530 is a structured rule that governs the consideration of H.R. 4516, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act related to contract borrowing and credit authority. The rule also waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI regarding unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill.

Under the rule, there will be 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the rule provides for consideration of only those amendments listed in the Committee on Rules report. This type of structured rule has become customary for Legislative Branch spending bills because of the controversy that often surrounds them.

In the case of H.R. 4516, we have heard significant criticism about the funding levels in the bill, but those concerns should be allayed by this rule which makes in order a bipartisan manager's amendment that will add an extra \$95.8 million to the bill. These extra dollars will provide for a cost of living increase for House staff and the Capitol Police, as well as make possible the addition of 48 officers to the police force. The Library of Congress will benefit from an extra \$7.6 million to restore Congressional Research Service staff and provide for pay raises. The Government Printing Office will get \$18.3 million more, including funds to maintain documents in the deposi-

tory program that are only available in paper form. Funds will also be added to the accounts of the Architect of the Capitol, the General Accounting Office, and the Congressional Budget Office.

In addition to the manager's amendment which should quell most if not all of the controversy surrounding this legislation, the rule makes in order two other amendments. The first is a bipartisan amendment that would allow Members who do not use their entire budget allowance to return any unused portion to the Treasury. The savings would then be devoted to deficit or debt reduction. This concept, which has earned broad support in the past, encourages Members of Congress to lead by example and be frugal in their use of taxpayer dollars.

In the same vein of fiscal responsibility, the second amendment would devote all the savings from successful appropriations amendments that cut spending to debt reduction, unless the amendment already redirects the savings to other discretionary programs.

The three amendments listed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered only by the Member designated in the report and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report. These amendments shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. Finally, the rule provides the minority with an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

As a testament to the good work of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and his subcommittee, only nine amendments were filed with the Committee on Rules. Of those, three were withdrawn and one is the manager's amendment. On Tuesday, only one Member besides the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee testified on his amendment to the bill. So it would appear that there are few concerns about the bill and that this rule, even with its limitations, fulfills the needs of the vast majority of House Members.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2001 Legislative Branch appropriations bill continues our efforts which began in 1994 to scale back the Federal Government and balance the budget by cutting our spending first. Over the last 6 years, Congress has saved the taxpayers \$1.5 billion by looking to its own operations, staff and support systems for places to cut waste and inefficiencies. Since 1994, more than 5,900 positions have been eliminated, and all told we have downsized the Legislative Branch of government by 21 percent. This year's bill continues down this path of fiscal restraint, and legislative spending will be reduced by almost \$10 million, even with the added spending in the manager's amendment. Our efforts prove that Congress is willing to look in its own backyard and do its part to cut spending, balance the budget and pay down the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

TAYLOR) and the rest of the subcommittee for their hard work to put together a very lean bill in keeping with their allocation. They were willing to make the tough choices necessary to maintain fiscal responsibility and the American taxpayers appreciate it. Even with the addition of the manager's amendment, total spending on the Legislative Branch will be reduced from last year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule that is responsive to the concerns of the Members of this House and it deserves our support. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and support for a reasonable Legislative Branch spending bill which continues our commitment to a smaller, smarter government that works for the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule as well as to the Legislative Branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This rule is unfair and the bill is a prima facie case of penny wise and pound foolish. By grossly underfunding the operations of the Congress and its related agencies in order to live up to the terms of the Republican budget resolution, the reported bill endangers the safety of every Member, staff person and visitor to this building and our office buildings. As reported, the bill could lead to layoffs in our own offices as well as in all the support agencies of Congress and would deny cost of living adjustments to those staff who still had a job. The cuts in the reported bill would have eliminated funding for maintenance and safety improvements for this magnificent building that we are so privileged to work in as Members of Congress. In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill would hamper the ability of the Congress to do its job.

I am frankly amazed that the Republican majority has so little regard for this institution and the people who work in it.

1015

The subcommittee chairman told the Committee on Rules that the Republican majority has saved the American taxpayer \$1.5 billion in legislative branch funding since taking control of the Congress in 1995, but I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, at what cost have these savings been made.

I can certainly see the costs in the staff who work for us and by extension, for our constituents. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly difficult to attract or keep experienced staff, especially in this tight labor market, and especially when the Senate can pay staff considerably higher salaries.

I have the greatest admiration for the hundreds of young men and women who work in our offices and on the committees of this body, but we cannot hope to keep the best and the brightest of them if we cannot pay competitive salaries.

Paying the staff who work for us is not a waste of the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, and losing staff with the expertise and the complicated subjects we must address certainly will not help us do our job better. Fortunately, the manager's amendment restores some essential funding for the operation of the House, including the fiscal year 2001 COLA for staff and funds that will avert large-scale layoffs.

But this restoration of funds for the House operations, as well as the operations of the support agencies of the Congress, only came after the Republican leadership was embarrassed publicly. The manager's amendment adds \$95.8 million to the bill, but, Mr. Speaker, even with this additional funding, we still face a cut from current services, and the bill makes no investment for the future of this institution.

As a case in point, I would like to point to the Congressional Research Service, an organization that is critically important to all of our personal offices as well as to every committee. Some of the most valuable assets the House has at its disposal are the senior analysts at CRS whose institutional memory, extensive knowledge and proven abilities are at our disposal.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, many of these senior analysts are approaching retirement and in an effort to properly train their replacements CRS has undertaken a "succession initiative."

This initiative is designed to hire junior employees to work alongside of the senior analysts they will eventually replace in order to benefit from the years of experience and knowledge of those analysts.

This is a wise investment in the future, Mr. Speaker, yet, this bill and the manager's amendment do not fund the initiative. I have to ask the Republican leadership if investing in the information resources this Congress depends on is a waste of the taxpayers' money or if it helps us do our job better?

Even with the addition of the funds in the manager's amendment, the Government Accounting Office and the Government Printing Office are still underfunded if we want them to serve the Congress in the manner we have come to expect.

I cannot see how shortchanging these organizations ultimately saves the taxpayer one red cent. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill. This bill cuts the legislative branch to the quick in order to pay for an irresponsible Republican tax cut. This bill is merely a symptom of the Republican majority's refusal to address the real needs of this country, saving Social Security and Medicare, investing in education, and providing a prescription drug benefit for senior Americans.

I also cannot support this rule, Mr. Speaker. The Republican majority on the Committee on Rules needlessly denied Democratic Members the right to offer amendments to this bill, while at the same time making an unnecessary

political point making Republican amendment in order.

For example, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) sought the right to offer an amendment which would have stricken a provision in the bill which would allow the Library of Congress to circumvent the terms of a negotiated settlement in *Cook v. Billington*, a class-action suit brought by African-American employees of the Library.

Why the Republican majority could not allow the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) to offer this amendment is a question for the ages, Mr. Speaker, but because of the Republican majority refusal to allow this matter to be debated, I must oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfair rule for a very bad bill. I urge Members to oppose the rule and oppose the bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess what this rule shows today is that no matter how hard and no matter how many rank and file Members work to try to reach a bipartisan agreement on appropriation bills, that, in the end, the majority party leadership insists on following a practice which will, once again, turn what should have been a bipartisan bill into another dog fight. I see no constructive purpose to be served by that.

Secondly, it puts provisions in this bill which are absolutely not germane to this bill.

The problem we have is that we have gone through this session and time after time after time, we have been told by the majority party thou shalt not offer nongermane legislative items to appropriation bills. And, yet, this bill does the very thing which we have been lectured on repeatedly and puts in order an amendment which most certainly goes far behind the scope of this bill; that is the so-called lockbox amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no expectation that I will win this point today, because I know that, especially in an election year, Members, unfortunately a lot of Members, focus a whole lot more on the political look of a proposal than they do on the substantive result.

Nonetheless, having the maddening tendency to expect reason and logic to penetrate legislative debate, I am going to make an argument on it, and my point is simply this: Right now, when we pass a budget resolution, that budget resolution gives us a certain number that we are supposed to work off for the remainder of the year in assigning priorities to different appropriation subcommittees.

The Committee on Appropriations has to reconcile desires, conflicting desires, to use every dollar in that allocation for a wide variety of purposes, thousands of competing demands for those resources. This amendment will make that process immeasurably more complicated. It will contribute immeasurably to additional delay in the consideration of appropriations conference reports and make more likely both a government shutdown and makes more likely the fact that you will never get your work done.

And here is why I say that: Right now if a Member offers an amendment on the floor that cuts a million dollars out of, say, a bomber program in the House, if this provision were in place, that money would have to be put in the lockbox, and you could not then spend it. You could not then spend it for other items in other subcommittee areas.

And then let us say the Senate, if the Senate, operating under the same rule, cut a million dollars from another weapons system, that money could not then be spent in conference and yet you would have lowered the overall amount by \$2 million, each body would have lowered it for a different item, and you would have no way to reconcile that without cutting other Defense programs that neither House had any intention of cutting.

This is one of those amendments that looks terrific if you have never been on the committee that has to work through these compromises, if you have never served on an appropriations conference committee. This is one of those amendments that looks fine on the surface, but when you get into the detail, makes this place an immeasurably more difficult place in which to get our work done.

Now, if the majority party leadership thinks that is a constructive thing to do, then it is certainly within their power to impose this decision on the House. But I, for one, having worked for weeks trying to negotiate a reasonable compromise on this bill and having thought that we had done just that until a day ago, I now discover that, once again, we have got a political amendment coming in from left field.

It is not a constructive thing to do, and I do not intend to vote for either this rule or this bill if that amendment is adopted.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the time and congratulate her for leading this very important piece of legislation, which, obviously, based on what I have heard from the other side, seems to be controversial. I

am happy we are going to be proceeding with a bipartisan manager's amendment.

My very good friend, the gentleman from Arizona, (Mr. PASTOR) has been working closely with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman of the Subcommittee of Legislative, and I believe that we will have addressed a number of the concerns that have been raised by Members so far in that manager's amendment, and I think that is a positive thing.

I am pleased that this bill, under the leadership of my very good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and others is continuing to pursue that goal which we have effectively implemented over the past several years since we have taken control, and that is making this institution more open and accountable to the American people while at the same time ensuring that we have the resources necessary to keep this very important first branch.

Look at the Constitution, the first branch of the Federal Government in operation. Now, when we look at the challenges that we have here in this institution, making sure that we have first-rate Capitol Police, the Architect of the Capitol, and we know that this work has been going on outside on the Dome there and it looks as if they are moving ahead very effectively with that. Now, that symbol to the rest of the world that we are the beacon of hope and freedom is an important one, and coverage for that comes within this legislative branch bill.

The Government Printing Office is very important, the General Accounting Office, and under this manager's amendment that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) have worked on, it is going to ensure that we do not have to face layoffs there. I want to specifically raise an issue which I believe is very important for the people whom I am privileged to represent and I know for people all over the country.

In the manager's amendment there will be the restoration of \$13 million dollars to ensure that our constituents are going to be able to go to the comfort of their local library and have access to very important information. I want to do everything that we possibly can to encourage the accessibility through electronic means of documents that come from the Federal Government, but we cannot forget the fact that there are people who do want to have the hard copy, the printed access to printed material.

I believe that the manager's amendment that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) have worked on will restore those funds which are very important.

I believe this is a fair rule. It is a very balanced rule. It takes into consideration a wide range of concerns.

And I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for once again keeping us right on schedule, moving ahead with this very important measure. We all anxiously look forward to the completion of all 13 appropriation bills, and I am happy that, when possible, we have been able to work in a bipartisan way, and I am hoping that we will be able to do that in the coming weeks.

1030

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this rule and also the bill, as I have in committee. I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) have worked very carefully to try to design a bill that takes care of the needs of running the government here, but also at the same time keeping a close eye on the budget and the constraints.

I also wanted to mention the question of the lockbox, because I think it is important for us to have this lockbox amendment. The reason why, as a new Member to the United States Congress in 1993, I remember we were trying to put in some fiscal discipline and restraint in our spending.

At the time, one of our fellow class members, MIKE CRAPO from Idaho, who is now across the hall, he had an idea we should do something like this. The reason why is we would debate for hours cutting something from the budget, something that some Members supported, some Members did not support. But the idea behind it was that we would fight for two or three hours in good, honest debate and we would eliminate this item and save \$1 million, \$2 million, \$10 million, whatever.

Then we would go home and think, boy, that was good, we cut \$1 million out of the budget. But we find out we did not cut it out of the budget, all we did was put it aside. Then the bill would progress through the system, get into the Senate, and they would spend it because the bill did not reduce itself in the amount.

Can Members imagine sitting around the table and writing down the grocery list. They go to the grocery store and say, I am going to buy some steak. Steak is say \$10. I do not really know the price of that. Number one, I am not running for the Senate, where you have to know the price of groceries. Number two, we do not buy steak in our family. We have four kids. We just cannot do it.

But say we are going to buy steak and it is \$10, and we go there and say, we really do not have this money. We need to buy hamburger, instead. That is \$5. We do not say, obviously, that we are going to buy \$10 worth of hamburgers. The point, the purpose of the

whole exercise is to save the money and put the extra \$5 in our pocket and use that for the car payment, the house payment, gasoline, or whatever.

That is what American families do every day. But in the United States Congress, what we say is we are not going to eat steak, we are just going to spend an equal amount of money elsewhere. That is ridiculous. Our whole idea is that when we had a fair debate and an honest vote to save money, then that money should go into a lockbox and be protected for social security or Medicare and no other purpose.

For 30 years this Congress on a bipartisan basis raided the social security trust fund and used the money for other expenses. Our idea is to put it in that vault and keep it for our retirements, what private companies do with pension plans. And it makes common sense.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, the example the gentleman gave where one goes to the grocery store with \$10 and decides that they can only buy or want to buy \$5 of hamburger, which we all do, then we may want to spend that money for gas or for maybe other items in the grocery store.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are asking to do by denying the Ryan amendment. If we are only able to spend \$5 for hamburgers, but yet we know we have other priorities where we want to spend the money, in the Committee on Appropriations we want the flexibility to do that. If we put it in the lockbox, as I understand the amendment, then we spend the \$5 and we will not have the flexibility to pay the gas and pay the electric bills.

I think what we are asking and saying is that the concept is good, but in the procedure and the process as we try to work in funding the government, and programs that people may want or we think are important, we lose that flexibility. I think that is why the debate is against the Ryan amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an example. The Slaughter amendment that was on the floor last week on the arts, the gentlewoman from New York in an earlier paragraph of the bill tried to cut several million dollars from one account so that when we got to the next paragraph in the bill, she could use that money for another purpose. She was not allowed by the House to consider both items at the same time.

So the House first adopted the first half of her amendment, and then had a donnybrook about what would happen to it when we got to the next paragraph.

If she had instead told the House that she wanted to cut \$22 million out of the Interior bill so that when we came to this bill we could use it for border inspectors, for instance, what that lockbox amendment would say is that we could not transfer that money for that purpose. We could only use it to reduce the amount of spending in that bill, and we could not use it for the purpose which was intended, because our rules prevent us from transferring money from one appropriation bill to another at that point in time.

That is the problem with the bill. It means that the legislative intent of the House as expressed by the sponsor, if a majority votes for that amendment, cannot then be carried out in a subsequent bill. That is why the lockbox is a well-intentioned idea but it has a harebrained result, and it does not have diddly squat to do with Medicare and social security, and the gentleman knows it. If he does not, he ought to go back and look at the rules.

Mr. PASTOR. Let me make another point, Mr. Speaker. When we adopted the budget it gave us an allocation for the Committee on Appropriations, on which my dear friend also serves. We have been involved in a number of the allocations, how they go up, they go down, because there are priorities that the majority may want. There are needs.

Everybody is for reducing the debt. I think that is decided when we develop or adopt the budget. Once we adopt the allocation, there are debates in subcommittee, there are debates in committee, and then we have to go to the floor. Then we have to go to conference with the Senate.

I believe what this amendment does is basically ties the gentleman's hands and my hands to be able to debate and determine priorities, and be able to buy 5 pounds of hamburger, but also spend some additional money that we may need for other purposes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the way I look at it is that the intent is to put the money in fact in Medicare as opposed to the NEA or the AmeriCorps or public broadcasting or whatever else. The idea behind it is to say Medicare is a much higher priority, and we are comfortable in making that blanket statement.

As the gentleman knows, we can continue in the Committee on Appropriations on the subcommittee and the full committee level to move monies back and forth, and we can have offsets within the title of a bill, or even on the House floor with it.

But I do not consider it a big partisan issue. I think now the Vice President has actually endorsed this idea, so I do not consider this a partisan thing whatsoever. But I do think that it is just an idea that would further protect

Medicare and social security. That is why I have supported it.

Mr. PASTOR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it is an idea, but once we adopt the amendment it becomes part of the law. I think the intent is great, but the result if adopted is going to hinder the gentleman and hinder me in the appropriation process to be able to allocate money for those priorities that we may have.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule.

There are going to be three amendments. One will be an amendment supported by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the ranking member, and myself. We have worked hard since the original 302 allocations were given our committee, and they have been raised. We have been successful in that effort, and the amendment that we will take up first will be to debate and to offer the House the changes that we have made.

If we do not pass the rule, we cannot debate the other amendments, and they will have debate, and then we can let the House work its will on the other two amendments that we have. We think that this is a good bill. We think that the technology that we have used is enabling the House, like the rest of the country in its use of technology, to be more efficient and carry on the work of the Congress. So I urge passage of the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the rule. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. It addresses the major points of controversy in a bipartisan manner. The Committee on Rules and the House leadership have responded to the concerns about the funding levels for the personnel who support this institution.

That is why the rule makes in order a manager's amendment to add resources to support the Capitol Police, House staff, CRS employees, and others who work hard to make the legislative branch a safe and efficient work environment, as well as a top tourist attraction for our visitors.

In addition, the rule offers my colleagues the opportunity to vote for greater fiscal responsibility, not only through passage of the underlying bill, but also through amendments that would allow us to devote more resources to that reduction.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this fair rule, and urge those who talk the talk about fiscal responsibility to walk the walk and support the Leg branch appropriations bill.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule that is under consideration and urge

all of my colleagues to join me. In addition, I must voice my support of the U.S. Copyright Office. While great efforts were made in funding this bill, I urge my colleagues to restore the minimum necessary funding which the Office requires for its operations on behalf of the public interest during the House-Senate conference.

Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee retains jurisdiction over copyright law. I think I speak for all who are privileged to serve on this committee by acknowledging that we could not function effectively without the assistance of the Copyright Office. The Office works with our constituents—individuals as well as businesses and the high tech community—who register original works of authorship for protection under title 17 of the U.S. Code. The advice and counsel afforded the Congress by the Register's policy staff have been indispensable in our efforts to develop good copyright law through the years. The United States is the world leader in the development and export of intellectual property, including copyrighted works. We cannot take the sustenance of this vital component of our national economy for granted; and as such, we cannot take the services of the Copyright Office for granted.

I have great respect for our appropriators, and I acknowledge that they have an unenviable task. That said, the cuts contemplated in the bill before us are based on erroneous assumptions. To begin with, the Copyright Act prescribes a two-year process by which new fees are established. The Office raised fees only last July. In addition, it is in the process of reviewing a new fee schedule which, if approved by Congress, will take effect in 2002.

In light of this background, Mr. Speaker, the cuts set forth in this bill are untenable. A full \$5-million hit will result in a 38 percent reduction in the net appropriations of the Office. In lay terms, this translates into a 27 percent staff reduction, or 130 employees. Again, the Office cannot raise fees until 2002 at the earliest, so the revenue cannot be made up or re-directed from elsewhere. This would include tapping the so-called "No Year Account" of roughly \$2 million, which is being held to offset expected deficits in 2002. Even if the Office uses these funds, there will still be staff reductions totaling 78 workers in the upcoming fiscal year, and another 52 workers in 2002.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about all of \$5 million for a government entity that provides critical services to the Congress and the public. If we are to continue as the world leader in the development and export of intellectual property we must ensure that the Copyright Office is adequately funded. It is my greatest hope that upon the meeting of the Legislative Branch conference, they will have the ability to re-visit this issue and fully restore Copyright Office funding.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and urge each of my colleagues to pass this rule. However, tonight I also appear before you in support of full funding for the U.S. Copyright Office.

The bill that the House will consider later tonight, as explained to me, represents a 38 percent reduction in the Office's total net funding. In human terms, this corresponds to a pink slip for at least one of every four employees at the Office. And siphoning money from the Office's "No Year Account" will only delay

the inevitable; roughly the same number of people would lose their jobs through Fiscal Year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about all of \$5 million for what amounts to a tiny government entity. Tiny, but important. The Copyright Office registers works submitted for copyrights and makes these works available to the Library of Congress for its collections and exchange programs. The resulting cuts set forth in the bill would greatly compromise the ability of the Office to provide a timely and accurate public records of copyright ownership. Applications for registrations would plummet, thereby generating irreplaceable losses to the collections of the Library of Congress. The mandatory deposit system, along with public information services, would suffer. And from our own little corner of the world, we in the Congress would be denied necessary counsel from the leading federal entity on copyright law and policy.

Mr. Speaker, copyright industries constitute the largest segment of our national economy. While I both respect and admire the work of the appropriators, in this instance I believe the Congress is acting in a penny-wise but pound-foolish manner. While I support passage of the rule and the forthcoming bill, it is my hope that during the conference it is possible to restore the necessary funding for the U.S. Copyright Office.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 173, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—234

Abercrombie	Burton	Doolittle
Aderholt	Buyer	Dreier
Armey	Callahan	Duncan
Bachus	Calvert	Dunn
Ballenger	Camp	Ehlers
Barr	Campbell	Ehrlich
Barrett (NE)	Canady	Emerson
Bartlett	Cannon	Eshoo
Barton	Cardin	Everett
Bass	Castle	Ewing
Bateman	Chabot	Fletcher
Bereuter	Chambliss	Foley
Biggert	Chenoweth-Hage	Forbes
Bilbray	Coble	Ford
Bilirakis	Coburn	Fowler
Blagojevich	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Bliley	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cooksey	Galleghy
Boehlert	Cox	Ganske
Boehner	Crane	Gekas
Bonilla	Cubin	Gibbons
Bono	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Boswell	Davis (VA)	Gillmor
Boyd	Deal	Gilman
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Goode
Brown (FL)	DeMint	Goodlatte
Bryant	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Burr	Dickey	Goss

Graham	McInnis	Sanford
Granger	McIntosh	Saxton
Green (WI)	McIntyre	Scarborough
Greenwood	McKeon	Schaffer
Gutknecht	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)	Sessions
Hansen	Metcalf	Shadegg
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shaw
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Shays
Hayworth	Miller, Gary	Sherwood
Hefley	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Herger	Morella	Shows
Hill (MT)	Murtha	Shuster
Hilleary	Myrick	Simpson
Hoeffel	Nethercutt	Sisisky
Hoekstra	Ney	Skeen
Horn	Northup	Skelton
Hostettler	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Hulshof	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Hutchinson	Ose	Souder
Hyde	Oxley	Spence
Isakson	Packard	Stearns
Istook	Pascarell	Stump
Jenkins	Pastor	Sununu
Johnson (CT)	Paul	Sweeney
Johnson, Sam	Pease	Talent
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Tancredo
Kanjorski	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Pickering	Terry
Kelly	Pickett	Thornberry
King (NY)	Pitts	Thune
Kingston	Pombo	Tiahrt
Knollenberg	Portman	Toomey
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Trafficant
LaHood	Quinn	Upton
Largent	Radanovich	Vitter
Latham	Ramstad	Walden
LaTourette	Regula	Walsh
Lazio	Reynolds	Wamp
Leach	Riley	Watkins
Lewis (CA)	Rogan	Watts (OK)
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Lucas (OK)	Roukema	Whitfield
Maloney (CT)	Royce	Wicker
Manzullo	Ryan (WI)	Wilson
Martinez	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
McHugh	Salmon	Young (FL)

NAYS—173

Ackerman	Doyle	Lowey
Allen	Edwards	Lucas (KY)
Andrews	Etheridge	Luther
Baca	Evans	Maloney (NY)
Baird	Farr	Markey
Baldacci	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Baldwin	Frost	Matsui
Barcia	Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)
Barrett (WI)	Gephardt	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Gonzalez	McDermott
Bentsen	Gordon	McGovern
Berkley	Green (TX)	McKinney
Berman	Gutierrez	Meehan
Berry	Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Bishop	Hill (IN)	Millender-
Blumenauer	Hilliard	McDonald
Bonior	Hinchee	Miller, George
Borski	Hinojosa	Minge
Boucher	Holden	Mink
Brady (PA)	Holt	Moakley
Brown (OH)	Hooley	Moore
Capps	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Capuano	Inslee	Nadler
Carson	Clay	Napolitano
Clay	Clayton	Neal
Clayton	Clement	Oberstar
Clement	Clyburn	Obey
Clyburn	Condit	Olver
Condit	Conyers	Owens
Coyers	Costello	Pallone
Coyne	Coyne	Payne
Cramer	Cramer	Pelosi
Crowley	Crowley	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Danner	Pelphs
Davis (FL)	Davis (FL)	Phemoy
Davis (IL)	Davis (IL)	Price (NC)
DeFazio	DeFazio	Rahall
DeGette	DeGette	Reyes
Delahunt	Delahunt	Rivers
DeLauro	DeLauro	Rodriguez
Deutsch	Deutsch	Roemer
Dicks	Dicks	Rothman
Levin	Levin	Rush
Lewis (GA)	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Lipinski	Lipinski	Sanchez
Lofgren	Lofgren	Sanders

Sandlin	Stenholm	Udall (NM)
Sawyer	Strickland	Velazquez
Schakowsky	Stupak	Waters
Scott	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tauscher	Waxman
Sherman	Taylor (MS)	Weiner
Slaughter	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Smith (WA)	Thompson (MS)	Weygand
Snyder	Thurman	Woolsey
Spratt	Tierney	Wu
Stabenow	Turner	
Stark	Udall (CO)	

NOT VOTING—27

Archer	Hobson	Roybal-Allard
Baker	Hunter	Tauzin
Cook	Klink	Thomas
Cummings	Kuykendall	Towns
Engel	McCollum	Vento
English	McCreery	Visclosky
Fattah	Mollohan	Wise
Filner	Porter	Wynn
Fossella	Rangel	Young (AK)

1100

Messrs. MOAKLEY, UDALL of New Mexico, DOGGETT, and RAHALL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 20001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4516.

1103

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN 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 North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).