just keep floating around out there. And, naturally, it is looking for a vehicle to be attached to because as a stand-alone, chances are it will not come before us.

So I am very disappointed to hear it will not be a part of the product that we will be addressing probably tomorrow. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say that I hope that by this afternoon we will have a resolution of this long-term problem. It would be a shame if the continued existence of these legislative provisions on environmental issues would prevent us from reaching agreement on the budget, and I hope that they are dropped so that we can proceed to give the country what it needed 6 months ago, which is completion of congressional action on all of these appropriation bills.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Pursuant to House Resolution 411, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as modified.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 400, nays 14, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—14

Barton
Becerra
Clyburn
Coble
Gibbons
Hastings (FL)
Hyde
McHale
Owens
Scarborough
Stearns
Thurman
Velazquez
Williams

NOT VOTING—18

Allard
Berman
Bryant (TX)
Coyne
Fazio
Foglietta
Johnston
Laughlin
McDade
Menendez
Oxley
Parker
Riggs
Schaefer
Schroeder
Towns
Vento
Wilson

☐ 1222

Mr. STEARNS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DORNAN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 129, I was unavoidably detained on other congressional business and could not be present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 175, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to make the following technical change in the engrossment of House Joint Resolution 175:

Strike the matter designating title I and section 101 and insert in lieu thereof ''That''.

This is a technical change. It corrects the section numbering. It has been cleared by the minority.

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

There was no objection.

PAPERWORK ELIMINATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal

paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], 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. LINDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996. This rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

House Resolution 409 makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill. Any Member will have the opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions as is the right of the minority. Under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has had that amendment preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased this bill will be considered under an open rule, which was unanimously approved by the Rules Committee yesterday. While the chairman of the Small Business Committee testified to the Rules Committee that she did not expect many amendments, this rule will provide the entire House with sufficient time to offer amendments and express any persisting apprehension about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have endured a brutal winter and welcome the arrival of spring. Unfortunately, our citizens still must deal with a blizzard of Federal paperwork requirements. As we approach the 21st century, the Paperwork Elimination Act recognizes the coming of non-paper-dependent information technologies, and will help reduce the avalanche of paper that has covered American taxpayers and small businesses.

I strongly supported the Paperwork Reduction Act that this Congress passed during the consideration of the Contract With America. That bill reduced the information collection burdens on the public and assured a more efficient and productive administration of information resources. Today's legislation builds upon the progress in paperwork reduction brought about by the enactment of that reform legislation.

The legislation before us today will further reduce the burden of Federal paperwork on small businesses and individuals by providing for the optional use of electronic technologies to meet the demands of Federal paperwork regulations. The American people spend billions of hours every year filling out Federal forms and submitting records to the Government, and it makes sense to allow those who have the capacity to comply with regulations by computer to take advantage of the information superhighway.

The Rules Committee heard testimony that the amount of time and effort spent by our citizens in complying with Federal regulatory paperwork represents a dollar value equal to 9 percent of the gross domestic product. The time and effort filling out paperwork would be better spent on the creation of new jobs.

I have always believed that those nations that have achieved the most impressive growth in the past have not been those with rigid Government controls, and we all know that Federal regulations and paperwork requirements are strangling job creation and productivity. Excessive Government regulatory mandates are not beneficial to economic development, and this bill enables small businesses and all taxpayers to save valuable time and money.

The Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996 has received considerable support, and I want to recognize Chairman JAN MEYERS and Representative PETER TORKILDSEN, chairman of the Small Business Committee's Government Programs Subcommittee. Their bill effectively reduces the paperwork burden, and also benefits the environment by reducing both the need for and the disposal of paper products. They have crafted sound legislation which I believe will receive overwhelming bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2715 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Small Business by voice vote, and this rule received the unanimous support of the Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I look forward to a thoughtful debate on the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following extraneous material for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 23, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open[2]	46	44	62	59
Modified Closed[3]	49	47	26	25
Closed[4]	9	9	17	16
Total	104	100	105	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 23, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223–182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands.	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244–166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 2715, a bill to reduce the burden of Federal paperwork requirements for small businessmen and individuals.

The bill, the Paperwork Elimination Act, follows last year's enactment of the Paperwork Reduction Act. It is a continuation of Congress' efforts to reduce the demands made on our citizens as a result of Federal regulation.

As my colleague from Georgia has described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

Under this rule, amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments.

This rule is an easy one for me to support. The normal committee process was followed before the bill was presented to the Rules Committee. The Small Business Committee held a public hearing to consider the bill's provisions. Then the committee held a markup, amended the bill, and reported it by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the kind of rule the Rules Committee should be reporting. This is the kind of process the House should be following.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. 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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). Pursuant to House Resolution 409 and rule XXIII, 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. 2715.

The Chair designates the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1237

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. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman pro tempore, 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 gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to cosponsor and support the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, legislation which is sponsored by Congressman TORKILDSEN.

This legislation is a winner. Potentially, it will contribute to billions of dollars of savings in reduced regulatory compliance costs that small business and the public must pay in order to meet the Federal Governments paperwork demands. It is not only user friendly, it is also environmentally and public friendly.

I urge my colleagues vote for this bill.

Congressman TORKILDSEN is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Programs of the Small Business Committee. As a result of his work, the full committee voted unanimously on March 29 to report the bill favorably. This bill enjoys bipartisan support. The administration testified, welcomed the congressional support and attention the bill represents, and suggested an amendment which was adopted. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration joined in the support. So did the small business witnesses.

We on the Small Business Committee have heard testimony that the dollar cost of Federal paperwork demands approximates $510 billion annually. In 1992 that dollar amount estimate of the time and effort the American public spends to meet regulatory paperwork requirements equalled 9 percent of the gross domestic product. I believe that percentage would be about the same today.

Small business pays a disproportionate share of that burden. That huge figure gives you a picture of the cumulative costs. Too frequently, these costs are barriers to job creation, job preservation, and economic productivity. They are the costs of Government which are hidden taxes because the money must be paid, and it is not paid by Government spending or collected by the Internal Revenue Service.

Given the significant role small business and small business entrepreneurs play in our economy, it makes common sense to do what is possible to eliminate and reduce these costs. The Paperwork Elimination Act emphasizes the opportunity provided to reduce costs by electronic compliance with the information demands of regulatory compliance.

This bill builds on the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. We passed that legislation as part of the Contract With America last session. Every Democrat and Republican voted for that measure and the President enthusiastically singed it last May. It went into effect his past October.

The Congress established burden reduction goals for the executive branch in that act. We in the House were particularly enthusiastic that the goals be established and that we try to meet them. For the next 2 years, the goals is to reduce the overall burden of Federal paperwork requirements by 10 percent. For the following 4 years the goal becomes 5 percent each year.

There were and continue to be serious skeptics as to whether these goals can be reached. We all agree that the Federal Government should aspire and do what it can to reach them. After all, 10 percent of $510 billion would be a hidden tax reduction of $51 billion.

For many of us, and I think we should thank Mr. TORKILDSEN for continuing to work on this, what makes those goals reasonable is the promise of the information age we live in. New information technologies, such as the growing use of computers and modems, which even the children are learning to use, holds out the promise that the paperwork costs can be reduced. If the Government gets smarter in leading the way for the public's use of new technology, those reduction goals can be reached.

The Paperwork Elimination Act is intended to help.

It requires Federal agencies to think strategically and consider how to provide electronic options to regulatory compliance each and every time an agency comes up with a new proposal for reporting, recordkeeping, or disclosure of information.

It requires that the electronic option be considered when agencies review their continuing information demands every 3 years. And it requires the Director of OMB, through the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs [OIRA], to oversee and implement the Governmentwide adoption of the electronic option.

Lastly, it adds to the existing reporting requirement to Congress that instances of successes and failures be brought to the Congress' attention. That will enhance our oversight function and give us feedback on whether the reduction goals are being met.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill strikes a blow for a commonsense approach to regulatory and paperwork relief that all of us should support.

□ 1245

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We share jurisdiction with that committee, and Chairman CLINGER reviewed the work that we had done on it and waived his jurisdiction.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my chairman.

H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, was originally referred to both the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the Small Business Committee; however, after reviewing the legislation as reported from the Small Business Committee, the Government Reform Committee waived jurisdiction to formally consider the bill.

I believe that this legislation should be considered and passed without any delay. It is good for the Government and is good for those who are required to provide information to the Government. Moreover, it does not cost money.

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply provides that the Government should take steps to allow, and even encourage, the use of electronic information technology in order to reduce the burden on individuals and businesses that disclose information to the Government. It does not require these information providers to use electronic means to supply the data; it merely permits them to do so if they have the capacity, and many do.

Enactment of this bill will simply recognize that paper copies are not the only way to provide data to the Government. It may well be easier for citizens to transmit data electronically and it is certainly easier for the Government to receive it this way. Thus, I view this bill as a winner for all concerned.

I know of no opposition to the bill, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time, and I want to applaud the gentlewoman's leadership in moving this bill through the full committee and to the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, will require the Federal Government to get smart about the information age we live in. It requires the executive branch to become computer user friendly and allow small business and individuals the option to file all information required by the Federal Government electronically. It also requires Federal agency to make documents and publications available electronically as well.

Small business bears the disproportionate share of these reporting costs. The legislation today focuses on how the use of electronic submission, maintenance and disclosure of information demanded by the Federal Government can reduce the cost on small business. But State and local governments, government contractors, educational and nonprofit institutions, and the public at large will also benefit by the improvements in this bill.

This legislation potentially eliminates billions of dollars of cost that small business and others face in meeting Federal information demands.

I would also like to thank the bill's cosponsors for their support of this effort, as well, and also the bipartisan comments of support from the other side of the aisle. This really has been a bill that we have worked together with support from both sides of the aisle, from both the White House as well as the legislative branch, and that is why the bill is moving as quickly as it is.

Mr. Chairman, where I come from in New England, small business represents 53 percent of the private work force. Viewing our economy, small business plays an increasing role in creating new jobs as well as sustaining existing jobs. In 1993, industries dominated by small firms, from banking to tourism and everything in between, posted a net gain of over 1 million jobs, as opposed to industries dominated by large firms which lost 200,000 jobs. So clearly small business has been the engine for job growth in New England and other areas.

On the national level, the role that small business plays in the health of our economy is compelling. Small business accounts for more than three-quarters of all businesses that export. Small business contributed roughly 40 percent of the Nation's new high technology jobs during the last decade.

The health of small business is vital to our economy. The focus of the Paperwork Reduction Act is to find ways to reduce the costs of complying with government mandates by using electronic means to meet regulatory paperwork requirements. This will promote the advantages of the information age we live in, and explore the use of new information technologies and eliminate barriers to job creation caused by wasteful paperwork requirements.

Mr. Chairman, the information needs of the Federal regulatory system touch everything. Paperwork demands range from tax returns, health care reimbursement forms, and contract bids, to OSHA material data work sheets and EPA chemical reporting forms. Over and over again, there is a need, and sometimes it is very legitimate, a need for information for the Federal Government to fulfill its functions. This legislation says the Government must provide an electronic option for these demands.

The bill builds upon and complements the Paperwork Reduction Act of last year, legislation which this Congress passed unanimously. It amends that Act by specifying that small business and people with access to computers and modems should be able to use them when dealing with the Federal Government.

Again, let me emphasize this is an option for small business and individuals. It is not a requirement that they go out and computerize, although most small businesses do have at least one computer now. This is an option for them to report electronically.

I want to stress that that option is key to the bill's success. We would not be here if it were another mandate on small business. Indeed, this is an option, but one that will save small business extensive money in meeting their reporting requirements.

Also importantly, though, this bill will save money for the Federal Government, as well. Once an agency is online to receive computer-generated information, it will reduce its own cost of manually inputting information for paper reports.

Federal paperwork requirements are nothing more than hidden taxes of Government programs. The Committee on Small Business has heard testimony that these costs easily run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, and they are costs that have to be paid. They are not paid in cash to the Federal Government, but they are paid nonetheless. It is important that we reduce some of those costs through this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation importantly is also environmentally friendly, as it substitutes paper with an electronic option. You do not need the paperwork. You do not need the actual forms to file with the Federal Government. Therefore, you do not have to produce the paper. Therefore, you do not have to cut down the number of trees you would need for those reams and reams of paper.

Let me give just a little example. For example, if you are a physician, you have to file this form, this one-page form, with HCFA on average about 8,000 times per physician. Now, 8,000 times is represented by the reams of paper right here. In 1 year, one physician just filing this one form, not counting the other forms they have to file with HCFA and other agencies, would have to use this much paper just for this one form.

Instead of producing all these forms that have to be filed, for every physician to file with HCFA, that information could be filed electronically. It could be stored on something as small as this disk.

So you are saving space. You are helping the environment by not needing to produce as much paper. You are saving costs to the Federal Government as well, because they will not

have to convert these handwritten forms into computer information, which is what their normal practice is. Most Federal agencies, when they receive these forms, do have someone convert them back from paper technology into computer technology. By taking out this paper mid-step, we will be able to save a great deal of cost, both for the private sector as well as for the taxpayers who have to pay the costs of that Federal agency.

Again, that is just one example out of thousands of reports that are required each and every year. In addition, there is a cost savings associated with this as well.

Filing the old-fashioned way on paper, one may find out in 6 or 8 weeks that there was a mistake. Maybe the person filling out the form left one space blank. Maybe they had the wrong serial number, some minor error. It will take 6 to 8 weeks just to receive notice that an error was made. The form has to be resubmitted.

In the meantime, your business, your operation is not receiving reimbursement for the service provided, or perhaps you are not in technical compliance with the reporting requirement, if it is a different type of form. By filing electronically, errors will be able to be spotted and corrected much more quickly, again saving time and money both for the private sector as well as for the Federal agency involved.

I think it is important to note that this is a step that will make the Federal Government friendly to the computer age; that we are saying that the Federal Government should be doing everything it can to make use of the great advances in technology that have happened, that have been developed mostly here in America, to see that anyone trying to create jobs will not have to pay any more than is necessary to meet these requirements.

This bill, the Paperwork Elimination Act, does not replace the Paperwork Reduction Act. At the same time we want to make sure that people can file any information electronically, we still want to keep an eye on reducing the actual cost of putting that information together and make sure that no information is being requested unless it is absolutely necessary for the public good and for the Federal Government to meet its legally obligated mission.

But this bill, this legislation, will go a long way in saying the Federal Government is willing to take the steps necessary to see that a small business, whether 1 or 5 or 50 employees, to see that small business has no more cost required on it than is absolutely necessary. That savings is good for that small business, it is good for job creation, it is good for the economy in general, and it is also good for the taxpayers.

I again applaud the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], the Chair of the committee, for the great leadership she has shown on this bill and all issues dealing with small business. I again urge all my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, and to commend Chairwoman MYERS for her work on this issue.

In this age of growing technology, we should encourage and offer even more opportunities for small businesses to improve productivity through technology. H.R. 2715 will make it easier for many small businesses to provide information electronically to the Government, resulting in a reduced paperwork burden.

I would caution though, this legislation is not the answer to all small business problems. As the use of information technology flourishes, a gap is growing larger between the technology haves and the have-nots.

It is true that a great many Americans send and receive electronic mail with their personal computers. Many conduct bank transactions online, from home. The Internal Revenue Service reported that at least 11 million Americans filed their Federal income taxes electronically.

But the whole truth is, the technology users I just described do not live in the lower-income communities, like mine. Most of my constituents do not have access to technology. This means many of the small businesses in my community are quickly falling into the widening technology gap.

These businesses cannot afford to hire experts to develop software applications. They will not be taking advantage of the electronic option provided by this bill—let alone afford the expensive initial investment in computer equipment.

Although I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation—keep in mind that we need to take this bill a step further. We must continue to look for ways that will help small, disadvantaged businesses again access to information technology. If we fail to do so, we may very well lose one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today as a proud cosponsor of the Paperwork Elimination Act. I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] for introducing this legislation and the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], chairwoman, for her role in bringing this to the floor.

Last year we passed the Paperwork Reduction Act. Now we are going to pass the Paperwork Elimination Act to further improve agency efficiency and responsiveness to the public. This bill recommends that our country's small businesses and Federal agencies move into the electronic information age. Some small businesses are required to file forms with up to 50 different Federal, State and local agencies.

□ 1300

This is absolutely incredible when you think about it. I believe that more of their time should be spent concentrating on providing quality goods and services to their customers. I believe this is an important piece of legislation for small businesses in my own district in southern New Jersey, as well as for small businesses around the country.

It provides small business owners with a more efficient and effective means to quickly complete agency requirements, thereby allowing them to get on with growing and improving their small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, before serving in Congress, I spent my time in a small business, in a small family business in southern New Jersey. Along with my father and my brother and some other family members, we struggled with some of the very problems that we are attempting to address today. I witnessed year after year where the requirements just seemed to grow more and more on what we were expected to provide back in the form of paperwork.

Now, as it was stated before, this will not be an answer to the entire problem, but it is certainly a step in the right direction, because for the district that I represent in southern New Jersey that has so many small businesses that are trying to make ends meet, that are trying to do the right thing to provide jobs, this will give them an opportunity to see a small glimmer of hope.

I try, as I am sure my colleagues do, to attend as many business and Chamber meetings as I can when home on district work periods. This is something that I hear over and over again: Will you please put a human face on what you are doing in Washington and understand the implications of the decisions you make on those of us who live in the real world?

Mr. Chairman, in that real world, the paperwork requirements are a tremendous problem. It is one we are beginning to recognize today, and I am very proud that we will have the opportunity to move this forward.

So again, I am asking all my colleagues to yet again demonstrate our commitment, the commitment of this Congress, to easing the regulatory burden on American small businesses by supporting this Paperwork Elimination Act.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Paperwork Elimination Act. This legislation builds on the Paperwork Reduction Act passed by the House last year, which was one of the top recommendations of the White House Conference on Small Business held last year.

I think Members of both parties can agree that the Federal paperwork demands on small businesses and individuals have become too time-consuming, expensive, and burdensome. It is estimated that business owners and ordinary citizens spend as much as 6 billion hours per year responding to Federal reporting requirements, ranging from employment forms from the Bureau of Labor Statistics to Internal Revenue Service returns, 6 billion hours of time that could be spent generating increased economic growth or helping kids with a school project.

H.R. 2715 provides the option of electronically submitting information needed to comply with Federal regulations. Small businesses and individuals can now send and receive mail, complete financial transactions, and read magazines and newspapers from their personal computer. There is no reason why they should not have the option of completing Federal Government forms by computer. Where possible, we need to simplify and streamline Government so that interaction with Government becomes more of a positive experience rather than a chore.

As a Member of the Committee on Small Business, I urge support for this legislation in order to better enable small businesses to compete and individuals to be productive in today's world.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the author, the ranking member, and the chairman.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2715 and would like to thank the gentlewoman from Kansas, Chairman MEYERS, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman TORKILDSEN, for their steadfast work on this legislation. The Paperwork Elimination Act is excellent legislation, and the efforts of the committee are to be commended.

This bill is a streamlining government bill, and my original intent was to offer a pro-small business friendly amendment to this legislation. After being informed, however, that the amendment would be opposed by the minority on technical grounds, I have decided to withdraw the amendment, with the intent of proposing it as part of some future legislation. I do, however, want to explain the rationale for the amendment.

Quite simply, the language I intended to offer requires that in-House agency printing of Government information be limited to certain levels so as to allow for agency convenience. Meanwhile, however, it ensures that larger nonclassified jobs are outsourced to the private sector for maximum savings to the taxpayer.

Under my proposal, in-House convenience would be a limit of 1,000 units, or sheets of paper, or for a multipage document up to 5,000 sheets of paper. The current regulatory limit is 5,000 and 25,000, but clearly this limit is much too high. There is no question, for example, that a job requiring 50 reams of paper is a job a local printer can do for less than the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Chairman, so you can see that my amendment was intended to act in unison and as a complement toward the goal of H.R. 2715, which is streamlining Government.

My amendment is pro-small business. Most private printers are the mom and pop types of shops that all of us have in our own districts. If we insist that the Federal Government send its work out for a competitive bid, all of those small businesses will have an opportunity to bid on this work and drive down the cost to the taxpayer in the process.

The beauty of it is it is the small business community who would have benefited most, small businesses and the American taxpayer. Of course, with more work going to the private sector, small businesses may have the need to step up their work force to meet the increased demand, thereby making this a worker-friendly amendment as well.

My amendment is highly taxpayer friendly. The Government Printing Office has an outstanding procurement office with a proven record of purchasing printing more cheaply from the private sector than can be done by the Federal Government. The agencies are not fully availing themselves of this service, and that is the heart of this issue.

My amendment would save the taxpayers precious resources at a time when every dollar counts. This amendment is efficiency in Government. The amendment makes Government smaller by streamlining printing operations.

How many print shops do we need in the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman? Certainly not one in every Federal agency. In the President's own words from a statement dated July 22, 1994, he says ''Reform legislation can improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of Government printing by maximizing the use of the private sector printing capability through open competitive procedures and by limiting Government-owned printing resources to those necessary to maintain a minimum core capacity.''

In explanation of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, we visited this issue before, and I would add under Democratic leadership. Section 207 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1995 reaffirms congressional intent that the GPO, and the GPO only, is the sole source of procurement of printing, including duplicating, for the entire Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as we look for ways to decrease the paperwork burden generated by the Federal Government, we must look at both the unnecessary paperwork it demands, as well as the unnecessary paperwork it does. As you might say, there are two sides to the paper, especially when the paper generated within the Federal Government is costing taxpayers millions more than they should be paying.

A preliminary CBO score of this provision which I have revised from legislation that I introduced earlier in this Congress indicates a savings to the taxpayer of around $150 million per year. I would have hoped my colleagues might have supported my amendment on this basis, and because it is pro-small business, protaxpayer, prostreamlining Government.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the adoption of my amendment in some future legislation, and I urge the support of the Paperwork Elimination Act.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to comment that there are more than 21 million small businesses in this country, according to current estimates. In recent years, these small enterprises have employed 54 percent of the private work force, contributed 52 percent of all sales in the United States, generated 50 percent of the private gross domestic product, and in 1994, they were responsible for an estimated 62 percent of the new jobs created. Thus, the term small is rather misleading when it comes to the real impact on our economy of small business.

I think it is important that we let them do what they do best, and that is generate innovative ideas, create jobs, and stimulate the economy. That is why this bill is so important, that we release them as much as possible from the burdens of paperwork.

These paperwork demands range from tax forms, loan applications, contract bids, EPA's chemical reporting for manufacturers to OSHA's material data sheets; all of these are informational requirements. We all know what we are talking about when we are talking about paperwork reduction and elimination.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is important, and I urge the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, as America rushes forward into the information age, the Federal Government is not keeping up. Instead of using new technology to streamline the application and reporting processes that individuals, State and local governments, businesses and nonprofits must provide—the paper pile continues to grow ever higher. For those at the grassroots, time, money, and jobs are lost in the process.

The Paperwork Elimination Act serves to cut through the reams of documents—particularly those which affect small businesses, and educational, and nonprofit institutions. It will minimize their burden through the use of computer technology. As a former University president, I know how effective this act will be.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Paperwork Elimination Act. In a few days, I will introduce a measure authorizing and encouraging electronic reporting. But today's vote is a beginning in reducing and eliminating unnecessary steps in the governmental processes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act.

At the end of March, Mr. Chairman, this legislation was reported out of the Small Business Committee by a voice vote.

Mr. Chairman, this is a non-controversial bill. It would accomplish several much needed reforms. First, Mr. Speaker, this bill would minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands on small businesses through the use of alternative electronic information technologies. Second, this bill would direct the Office of Management and Budget to act as the administrative body responsible for directing the Federal Government's efforts to promote and monitor the use of this new technology. Although, this would increase the administrative costs to OMB, it would not significantly impact the budget. Nor, Mr. Speaker, would it create new mandates for Federal agencies because it does not require agencies to acquire and implement these new technologies. The authority to do this already exists.

Mr. Chairman, small businesses are the engine that drive our economy. They employ a large percentage of our work force and indeed, job growth in small firms is far outstripping that in large companies, which are laying off whole sections of the work force.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will go a long way in removing the onerous paperwork burdens of small businesses, freeing them to concentrate their energies and creativity to producing higher quality products and expanding the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairwoman MEYERS for her diligent efforts in bringing this worthwhile legislation to the House floor and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2715.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Pursuant to the rule, each section is considered as having been read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and non-profit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, including the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper; and

(2) more effectively enable Federal agencies to achieve the purposes of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act.''

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY AND FUNTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) DIRECTION AND OVERSIGHT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—Section 3504(a)(1)(B)(vi) of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(vi) the acquisition and use of information technology, including the use of alternative information technologies, such as the use of electronic submission, maintenance, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper.''.

(b) PROMOTION OF USE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—Section 3504(h) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(6) specifically promote the optional use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information where appropriate, as an alternative information technology to substitute for paper.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. ASSIGNMENT OF TASKS AND DEADLINES.

Section 3505(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(D) a description of progress in providing for the use of electronic submission, maintenance, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper, including the extent to which such progress accomplishes reduction of burden on small businesses or other persons.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) PROVIDING FOR USE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.—Section 3506(c)(1)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) and by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) provides for the optional use, where appropriate, of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information; and''.

(b) PROMOTION OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.—Section 3506(c)(3)(C) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or'' after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii), by adding ''or'' after the semicolon at the end of clause (iii), and by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) the promotion and optional use, where appropriate, of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information.''.

(c) USE OF ALTERNATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 3506(c)(3)(J) of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(J) to the maximum extent practicable, uses alternative information technologies, including the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information, to reduce burden and improve data quality, agency efficiency and responsiveness to the public.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. PUBLIC INFORMATION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES; SUBMISSION TO DIRECTOR; APPROVAL AND DELEGATION.

Section 3507(a)(1)(D)(ii) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subclause (V), by adding ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subclause (VI), and by adding at the end the following:

''(VII) a description of how respondents may, if apprppriate, electronically maintain, submit, or disclose information under the collection of information.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. RESPONSIVENESS TO CONGRESS.

Section 3514(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(E) reduced the collection of information burden on small businesses and other persons through the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information, including—

''(i) a description of instances where such substitution has added to burden; and

''(ii) specific identification of such instances relating to the Internal Revenue Service.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect October 1, 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, 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. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses,

educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, pursuant to House Resolution 409, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. 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 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No 130]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Dicks
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Hastings (FL)
Houghton
Kasich
Laughlin
Livingston
McDade
Menendez
Parker
Schroeder
Whitfield
Wilson

□ 1332

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2715, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1675, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 410 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 410

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record on April 16, 1996 and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the