Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntosh
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—9

Clayton
Dellums
Etheridge
Harman
Kingston
McHugh
McIntyre
Payne
Price (NC)

☐ 1525

Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. HAMILTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAMILTON moves to recommit the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 58, to the Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—251

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King (NY)
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Markey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Pascrell
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—175

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Snyder
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson
Thornberry
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Clayton
Conyers
Etheridge
Kingston
McHugh
McIntyre
Price (NC)

☐ 1546

Mr. DICKS, and Mr. STRICKLAND changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAPERWORK ELIMINATION ACT OF 1997

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 88

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. 852) 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. Each section 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. 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 (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose 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. Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 852, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997, under an open rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

Members who have preprinted their amendments in the RECORD prior to their consideration will be given priority in recognition to offer their amendments, if otherwise consistent with House rules. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

The Paperwork Elimination Act will decrease the burden of Federal paperwork by requiring all Federal agencies to give small businesses, educational and nonprofit organizations, State and local governments the option of filing required information by means of electronic submission, such as e-mail, fax, and other means. This new ability will enable all of these organizations to save time and money, help ease the paperwork and regulatory burden on them and other taxpayers, and improve the efficiency and accuracy of Federal information collection.

My colleagues may remember that we unanimously passed identical legislation in the 104th Congress. Unfortunately, it was never considered by the other body.

I am glad we are again going to have the opportunity to free small businesses and other organizations from the shackles of oppressive, excessive Federal regulations. As a small business owner myself, I can say that too much time is spent filling out forms in order to comply with endless Federal regulation. Decreasing this burden will be very beneficial to all small business owners, as they will now be able spend their time and money on productive activities that will lead to the expansion of their business.

Finally, the Paperwork Elimination Act is a much-needed continuation of the popular Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, which the President signed into law on May 22, 1995. I was very supportive of the Paperwork Reduction Act, which reduced the information collection burdens on the public and ensured a more efficient and productive administration of information resources.

The legislation we will consider today builds upon that progress and paperwork reduction.

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, I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 852. It is a bill to reduce the burden of Federal paperwork requirements for small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments and others. The bill is virtually identical to the one, H.R. 2715, that was passed unanimously by the House last year. This measure is a continuation of Congress's effort to reduce the demands made on our citizens as a result of Federal regulation.

As my colleague from North Carolina 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. No hearings were conducted on this bill during the 105th Congress. However, eliminating this step is appropriate because of the extensive legislative history of H.R. 2715 from the 104th Congress, and the agreement was worked out between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this open rule and the bill.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE].

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK], a valuable new member of our Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time. I rise in full support of this rule and this bill. As my colleague has described, this is a very open rule. Any Member can be heard on any germane amendment to the bill at the appropriate time as long as it is consistent with the normal rules of the House.

Bills reported from the Committee on Small Business have traditionally been considered under open rules and this is no exception. The Paperwork Elimination Act is a timely, straightforward effort to bring the Federal Government further into the information age while at the same time reducing the public cost of meeting government's information needs. Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, the Federal Government is lagging behind the rest of the Nation in using new technology.

As the report on H.R. 852 points out, many individuals today can send and receive mail, take care of their personal finances or even read a newspaper, all from a personal computer. Those same individuals should be able to conduct much of their business with the Federal Government electronically as well.

That is what this legislation sets out to do. H.R. 852 will help minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands on small businesses and other entities by requiring executive branch agencies to provide for optional use of electronic technology to meet the information needs of the Federal Government.

The winners will not only be America's small businesses but also educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State, and local governments and others who face a disproportionate share of the burden of complying with the myriad of Federal regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I knew the regulatory burden on small business was heavy to begin with, but I was amazed to learn that the amount of time and effort spent in meeting the Government's paperwork demands has a dollar value roughly equivalent to 9 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product. Congress must lighten this load. By enabling the Federal Government to take

advantage of the information age, this legislation will enable small business owners across America to utilize smart technology available today to reduce those costs and to eliminate barriers to job creation and economic productivity. That means less time spent filing forms and more time innovating, expanding, and providing goods and services to our economy.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], the chairman of the committee, for bringing this important legislation forward and for crafting a commonsense solution to what has become a serious regulatory headache for many of our small businesses.

I urge adoption of this very fair and reasonable rule and this commonsense legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by complimenting the committee, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] and my Republican colleagues for bringing out this open rule and for bringing out this important piece of legislation which would reduce the paperwork that our constituents are burdened with in today's society.

I come to the floor this afternoon in support of the substance of this bill, but I want to raise another issue. The issue I want to raise is the question of campaign finance reform. We set our priorities in this institution by press conference, by meetings, by bipartisan meetings, and what is painfully missing from our set of priorities is a scheduled time in which this institution, all of us participating, under an open rule, similar to what we will be debating this bill under, can discuss an issue that is burning within the country. That issue is how do we solve this crisis that we have with campaign finance reform?

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is much disagreement on either side of the aisle that the way we finance our political campaigns in this country is broken. We all know that. The American people are increasingly becoming aware that it is broken. Each and every election demonstrates that it is broken.

In 1996 an estimated $2.7 billion, with a B, was spent on political campaigns. Now with recent court rulings, we know that the rules are wide open. We can spend what we want the way we want to spend it, virtually. We have got to do something to limit the influence of money in our campaigns. We need to fix the system. We need to limit the amount of money. We need to stop the negative advertising. We need to get on with voting again.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend has been a Member of this body for 20 years, longer than I have. He knows that rule XIV requires us to speak to the subject matter before us. His statement does not.

I am not going to interfere if the gentleman is going to finish his statement in his allotted time, but if I see other people doing this, we are going to have to abide by the rules of the House. I would say that out of respect to the gentleman as the minority whip that he certainly could continue, but I would hope that he would use his influence to make sure that we do abide by the rest of the rules.

I do thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman is welcome.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking this afternoon about the priorities. While paperwork reduction is a priority, and it is a good one, it may not be Earth-shattering but it is important. As I listened carefully to what the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] had to say, it consumes 9 percent, as I understand from her remarks, of the GNP in the country. That is a very big burden on this country. But it is also a burden on this country to be spending $2.7 billion on a system that we know is broke, that is eroding the confidence of the American people that this institution works, and I think that ought to be a priority as well.

Let me just say to my friends and colleagues this afternoon, on the opening day of this Congress we on this side of the aisle offered a proposal that would bring campaign finance reform to the floor within the first 100 days of this Congress. That obviously does not look like it is going to happen.

A few weeks ago, we had a bipartisan discussion to agree on a common agenda for this Congress. We did it over in the Senate. We did it with the President, Republicans, and Democrats, and this issue was not raised again.

Last week the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] began a series of procedural votes to protest the failure to schedule a debate on campaign finance reform. Today, in conclusion, I might add to my friend from New York, we are going to be offering on the previous question a motion that will say basically we have to debate this issue in an open and full way by May 31, before the Memorial Day recess, so we can meet the goal of trying to finish this by the Fourth of July.

We need a full and a fair debate on this proposal, as we are having and will have on the Paperwork Reduction Act. Every day that passes, the country becomes more and more disgusted with our failure to act. We need to get our people involved in the political process once again.

I want, Mr. Speaker, the election day in this country to mean something. I want every citizen of this country to feel an urgency and a seriousness about voting. And, most important, I want our schoolchildren studying the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution today to feel the same excitement that the authors felt more than 200 years ago.

So I urge my colleagues, vote today. It is not about a particular bill or a solution. I am not calling for any particular solution to this. What I am calling for is we set a time in which we can debate this. This is about setting up a process to debate the campaign finance reform bill, and I urge my colleagues, vote no on the previous question so that we can debate real campaign finance reform on the House floor before Memorial Day.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I too agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip, who was just in the well, that this is about our priorities and this rule is about our priorities and the previous question will be about our priorities. One hundred and eleven Members of this Congress at the beginning of this year or even before the first of this year, on a bipartisan basis, wrote to the Speaker of the House and asked that we have campaign finance reform in the first 100 days of this session of Congress. We are awaiting an answer from the Speaker on that issue. The silence is deafening.

At the same time, we see the minority leader in the Senate, [Mr. DASCHLE], has made campaign finance reform the top issue in their agenda and has asked the majority leader to do the same. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], minority leader in this House, has asked that we consider this within the first 100 days. President Clinton has called for action by July 4. Yet we hear nothing from the Republican leadership about campaign finance reform. Again, the silence is not only deafening, it is paralyzing us and an ability to deal with a system that the American public has come to disrespect, to understand is corrosive, to understand is corrupting, and yet we see nothing from the Republican side of the aisle to deal with campaign finance reform.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to determine whether debate being engaged in by the minority as an attempt to defeat the previous question is relevant to the pending rule and the legislation

it makes in order, it is necessary for us to have a copy of the minority's proposed amendment to the rule, and I would just ask if the Chair has been provided with the amendment and, if so, could the Chair provide us with a copy? The minority has not provided our side with it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, is there a copy at the desk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of an amendment.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may proceed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California yield for the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Is it not in order to simply oppose the rule?

Mr. SOLOMON. Sure. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may proceed.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman wants to discuss paperwork reduction, we can think of all of those corporations and all of those small businesses that are getting hit with subpoenas and interrogatories about whether or not they are a small business, whether or not they exist, whether or not the person that gave the money and their name is really a real person, whether the business is real or not.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this: The top priority of this Congress ought to be to get its house in order, and the cancer that is spreading throughout this institution and is spreading throughout our Government is the lack of decent, open, and fair ways to finance our campaigns. The current system is broken, it is corrupting of this institution, it is corrosive of our democratic institutions.

The American people deserve something better, and we deserve an answer from the Republicans as to a date certain when they will bring campaign finance reform to the floor of the House of Representatives so this House can work its will. There is no question but there is a majority of people on this floor to reform the existing system. We should not be denied an opportunity to do that, and we ought to rearrange the priorities of this Congress. We have been here now 3 months and we have rarely been in session. Yet somehow we cannot find time to deal with this most urgent matter in terms of the preserve of the best of our democratic institutions, the integrity of this House and the freedom of the American people to have a fair election and a fair outcome.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, if the spirit of bipartisanship that we have heard much about over the course of the last few days is to be any more meaningful than ''I'll smile at you if you'll smile at me,'' then I think that a place to start with true bipartisanship is to allow the people, Republican and Democrat alike, who want to do something about the increasingly corrupting influence of money and politics at all levels of our Federal elections, to give them an opportunity to come forward and craft a bipartisan solution to this tremendous problem.

Thoughts of bipartisanship and of campaign finance reform are hardly new to this institution. Indeed, in 1995 in New Hampshire, in the summer, in front of a senior citizens' group, we had many smiles from President Clinton and Speaker GINGRICH looking at each other, shaking hands, being very bipartisan and collegial and friendly over the concept of campaign finance reform. And what happened after that? Absolutely nothing. It took from that summer until the next summer before we got something in this House called reform week, which ended up being a reform hour, which denied to us an opportunity to consider the bipartisan Clean Congress Act, a measure that by its very name had broad bipartisan support and was designed to do something about the influence of money in our campaigns.

I believe the American people want us to address this problem. And so this afternoon, in the course of this particular bill, it is appropriate to talk about two things: priorities and paper.

When it comes to paper, I would maintain that the type of paperwork reduction that the American people are most concerned about at this time, when they are hearing about the Lincoln bedroom, when they are hearing about Republicans down at Palm Beach meeting with people that gave $100,000 in soft money to the Republican Party, the kind of paper that we ought to be concerned about reducing is the kind that says pay to the order of, pay to the order of whichever candidate or political committee or whatever is involved. We ought to be concerned about reducing that.

The only reason that we did not get a chance to address that issue in the last Congress and were cut off from a bipartisan opportunity to consider this national scandal, the only reason is because instead of paperwork reduction, our Speaker has been very candid in saying that he favors paperwork expansion. He does not think there is enough paper in the political process. He thinks we need more paper, we need more checks, we need to spend even more special interest money than is being expended at the current time in our political system.

I believe we need to be concerned about real paperwork reduction, and that is to reduce the influence of special interest money in our campaigns.

□ 1615

Hundreds of millions of dollars of so-called soft money that gets outside of the course of the current campaign financing laws, as deficient as they are, are being expended by both parties. There is no one perfect solution to this problem, there is no one perfect Democratic or Republican solution. Rather, we ought to have the opportunity on the floor of this House to come together and offer our different ideas, to not be restricted to an hour, as we were 2 years ago, and denied the opportunity to consider the only bipartisan proposal that was advanced at that time. We ought to be able to come together, reason together, and work out a solution to this most critical paperwork problem.

As my colleagues know, it is not for want of time that we have not considered this issue. We spent a week here last week whereby all we did was commend the Nicaraguans and Guatemalans, and I know that was a hard load for some, but I believe we can take on the harder jobs.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I would rather stand up here and talk about than what happened with the Lincoln bedroom, and what happened with economic espionage in this administration, what happened with the breaches of national security in this country by the administration. This is not the time to be discussing that, but I would be glad to take the well and discuss all of this at the appropriate time.

My parliamentary inquiry is this, Mr. Speaker: Under House Rule XIV, which requires that a Member must confine himself to the question under debate, is it relevant to the debate on either this rule or the bill it makes in order to engage in a discussion on the merits of campaign finance law?

Would the Speaker please rule on that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would be happy to refer all Members to page 529 of the Rules of the House, which says that debate on a special order providing for the consideration of a bill may range, and ''range'' is the appropriate word here, to the merits of a measure to be considered under that special order, but may not range to the merits of a bill, but should not range to the merits of a measure not to be considered.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, what you have just said is that we must confine our statements to the merits of the legislation before us, and I would

just ask the Chair to please enforce the rules of the House.

I have been informed by my good friend over here, and he is a good friend and trying to be congenial, but he now tells me he has a number of speakers that are going to pursue this issue that is not germane to the issue before us, and we just cannot have that. We have to abide by the rules of the House, and I would ask the Speaker to enforce the rules of the House from here on out.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question, and let me tell my colleagues why.

As we rise today to take up another burning issue on the GOP agenda, the Paperwork Reduction Act, I ask my Republican colleagues to allow us to debate a more meaningful reduction of paper. Let us talk about how we reduce the amount of paper money that exists in political campaigns today.

Our system of financing political campaigns is broken, and it is time for us to fix it. We may not all agree on the best way to fix the problem, but surely we can all agree on one thing, that there is too much paper money in political campaigns, it costs too much money to run for public office, we spend too much time raising money for our campaigns, and at the end of the day it takes our time away from the more important duties we are engaged in.

I know it, my colleagues know it. Most importantly, the American people know it.

Republicans in the House and Senate have asked for several million dollars to investigate campaign financing in the last election. Those investigations are important, and they should move forward, and they should not be used as an excuse to delay action on campaign finance reform.

All the Democrats are asking is this: Give us an open, unrestricted debate on campaign finance reform by May 31, by Memorial Day. We can get money out of politics and pass meaningful campaign finance reform, but first we need an open and a fair debate. Only one person can schedule a vote on campaign finance reform, and that is the Speaker of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop wasting time. Let us schedule a vote on campaign finance reform. Congress surely could stand a little paperwork reduction, but let us reduce the amount of money in politics.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I support the Paperwork Reduction Act, but I think it could be made better, and I think we can make it better and really reduce paperwork if we pass true, honest to goodness campaign finance reform. The American people want it, certainly my constituents want it, the President has asked for it. Why has the Republican leadership not made campaign finance reform a number one priority?

The Paperwork Reduction Act before us today is all fine and nice, and as I said, I do support it, but is this really our number one priority? Is this the number one priority of this Nation?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the majority leadership to bring campaign finance reform to the floor of this House by Memorial Day. Time is being lost, and the public disgust and skepticism is rising. We must act now on real campaign finance reform. I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question, and I urge the Republican leadership to please make campaign finance reform a number one priority.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on the debate on the rule on paperwork reduction. This is a debate that determines the procedures of the House, and this is the only way in which we can deal with the law that will come after this debate, the law on paperwork reduction. The only way we can get a debate on a new law is to schedule that debate on the floor, and I rise to the issue that this rule does not go far enough because it has not scheduled the real paperwork reduction in America, which is the reduction in the amount of money that flows into campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be debating the law on campaign reform. It was asked for by the President, it was promised by the Speaker, and it is certainly in demand by Members who are here today on both sides of the aisle.

We have bills before Congress. The work has been done on writing that law. There are many versions of it. But that law cannot reach the floor until the Committee on Rules sets the date, and the date ought to be before this country's next national birthday on July 4.

If we did, indeed, deal with this rule, we would be talking about real reduction, we would be talking about reduction in the time it takes to raise money, time that could be better spent in managing this Nation's affairs. We would be spending less time, certainly less paperwork, because there would be less checks written to campaigns. There would be less money flowing into Washington. There would be less time fund-raising. There would be more time spent governing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this rule because this rule does not go far enough, because this rule fails to bring what this Nation demands, and that is the real law of reform to this floor, which is campaign law reform.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of us worked very hard to bring to the American public the acknowledgment that we understood how hard they worked. The Paperwork Reduction Act simply says that we recognize that the business of America is to create jobs and not to be entangled with hostile paperwork and regulations, but yet we also recognize our responsibility in the U.S. Congress.

I think it is disappointing that this rule has not had or given us the opportunity to confront the real question that the American people are asking us: Can we clean up our own House? Can we reduce the entanglement and regulations of a misdirected campaign finance structure that really does not allow those who come here to work to work without the shackles of confusion and the shackles of debate on how we raise money to make sure that the voices of all Americans are heard?

I truly believe in the integrity of the Members of this House, that they come here, most of all, to represent their constituents and represent America, but until we get out in front and deal with the question of how we finance these elections, how we reemphasize the importance of making sure the average person has access to this U.S. Congress, I happen to be a supporter of the Farr bill. But what I think most of all is important in terms of campaign finance reform is that this House shows it means business and that it gets down to the business of both raising the question of campaign finance reform, debating the question of finance reform, and not hiding the ball.

It is crucial that we, as Members of this House, acknowledge to the American people that we are not tied up by the interests of others other than the interests of them that bring us to this body.

Mr. Speaker, it is so very important that this rule include campaign finance reform.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was taken earlier by Speaker GINGRICH and by Minority Leader GEPHARDT when they came to the floor and they talked about the need for comity in this body. But we are really being hard pressed here today. I know that this is Thursday, there is no session tomorrow, and Members do want to go home, but I feel moved to bring a point of order against the Members that are standing up talking about issues that are not germane to this issue, and certainly that would be upheld by the Chair because they are not germane. That of course would be subject to an appeal, if the minority saw fit to do. That would drag Members over here. That would prolong the

measures again. It would probably cause all kinds of problems.

So I am not going to press a point of order today. I am going to let my colleagues use up the balance of their time, but we just have to say out of courtesy to Members on both sides that we have to stick to the rules of the House. Rule 14 says that we must speak to the germaneness of the issues before us.

So I just wanted Members to do that, and I hope Members have a nice weekend.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his gentleness today. We are in the minority. We do not have a lot of control over the process here.

This is really a fight over control. When we were in control in 1975–76, we passed campaign finance reform. When I led the effort, we passed it twice, once vetoed by President Bush, and under our rules I am not allowed to name the Senator from Kentucky, but I can reference the gentleman from the other body in the majority party who has filibustered campaign reform to death in the past and threatens to do it again. I commend the committee for bringing this Paperwork Reduction Act before us. It is something we ought to do. But as we weigh our responsibilities as Members of Congress, one of the things happening is all our credibility is diminished by the present situation.

As my colleagues know, I think we ought to do something simple now. We ought to put a limit of $100, we ought to tax advertising so we have the resources to make a public match so every American can feel empowered to be part of this process.

Now I know that if we brought that bill and four or five others—I do not know that mine would win, but in that debate I know we would help build confidence in this system, we would at the end of the day take a step forward, and that is what this debate is really all about.

There are lots of vehicles that we will try to use, as the minority. Those guys have the majority; I recognize that. They make the rules; they make the decision as to what bills come to the floor and what bills do not come to the floor.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut is talking about how he is in the minority now. I am relatively new to the institution.

Mr. GEJDENSON. But the gentleman from Florida is doing real well for a new guy.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The gentleman is, too, and I like his hair in the spirit of Hershey and comity.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. But, as my colleagues know, if the gentleman could give me a little historical perspective as a relatively new Member here, I believe that they were all in the majority in 1993 and 1994, and I also believe that they had somebody in the White House who was also a Democrat. Could the gentleman tell me if they all passed campaign finance in 1993 or 1994 or if the gentleman's selective memory prevents him from doing this?

□ 1630

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say to the gentleman's question, we passed campaign finance reform and President George Bush vetoed it. We passed it through this House. It got to the Senate, and I can only reference the gentleman in the other body in the Republican Party from Kentucky who filibustered it to death, and in the opening days of this Congress he threatened to filibuster any new campaign reform bill to death.

We passed it, it got vetoed by President Bush. We passed it through the House, it was filibustered to death in the Senate.

What we are saying is, let us join together and pass a limit on spending. Let us limit the amount of money. Let us rebuild confidence in this system so we can work to reduce paperwork, so we can reduce the amount of time we spend raising money, and put our attention back on the people's business to take care of children, to make sure they have health care, to make sure the people losing their benefits have jobs and not street corners to hang out on.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise Members to avoid making references to Members of the other body.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on either side, and was the clock running when the gentleman used up all his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from New York the Chair is keeping very good time.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] has 23 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I certainly hope I have the same timekeeper on my two minutes as the previous speaker had on his one.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the previous speaker that the question that was asked was what happened while the Democrats had control in 1993 and 1994 and when they had control in the White House in 1993 and 1994.

The previous speaker almost moved me to tears in his very self-righteous indignation, and then blamed George Bush for killing it.

I may be a dumb country lawyer, I may have graduated from the University of Alabama, but my recollection was that George Bush was not President in 1993 or in 1994, that that was in fact William Jefferson Clinton.

I see some people shaking their heads, so maybe, maybe I am incorrect in this. But they can be self-righteous all they want. They had control over this Chamber over the two-year period in 1993 and 1994, they had the President of the United States, and they did not want to do anything on campaign finance reform.

Now they come to this well in self-righteous indignation trying to distract people. . . . And if they want to be self-righteous, if they want to get on the well of the floor and debate this, we will gladly do it for as long as you want to do it, because you do not have the moral high ground. And when you had a chance to change things, you did not do it, and you cannot rewrite history, as much as you would like to try.

So beat your chest in self-righteous indignation, but pray for the children tonight, pray for America and whatever you want to do, but the fact of the matter is, that you are being hypocrites.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down when he said that the White House had sold influence to Communist China and other things. There is no proof of that, and that is absolutely ridiculous, to come into this body and accuse the President of the United States of selling influence to a Communist nation.

I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will suspend.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

□ 1636

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] seek recognition?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my words about specifically mentioning the President . . . since while Newsweek has written an article about that those have not been proven yet, so I will specifically withdraw the statement regarding the President . . . .

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for making the correction, and that saves us a trip back to Hershey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized. The gentleman from Ohio has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment I intend to offer, if the previous question is defeated, be printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

''Section 2. No later than May 31, 1997, the House shall consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation under an open amendment process.''

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

Let me conclude my remarks by reminding my colleagues that defeating the previous question is an exercise in futility, because the minority wants to offer an amendment that will be ruled out of order as nongermane to this rule. So the vote is without substance.

The previous question vote itself is simply a procedural motion to close debate on this rule and proceed to a vote on its adoption. The vote has no substantive or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert an explanation of the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The explanation follows:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

House Rule XVII (''Previous Question'') provides in part that:

There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered.

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 187, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—26

Baker
Barton
Berman
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Costello
Dicks
Etheridge
Foglietta
Gallegly
Gutierrez
John
Kingston
Leach
Manton
McCarthy (MO)
McHugh
McIntyre
Meehan
Ortiz
Price (NC)
Roukema
Schaefer, Dan
Smith (TX)
Young (FL)

□ 1659

Messrs. MATSUI, PASTOR, and SPRATT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls No. 48 and 49 I was unavoidably detained in transit. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 48 and ''yes'' on rollcall No. 49.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 88 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 852.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] to assume the chair temporarily.

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. 852) 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. SENSENBRENNER (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. McCARTHY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side, which I understand the gentlewoman has no objection to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. McCARTHY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

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

Mr. Chairman, This is a noncontroversial but very significant bill, Mr. Chairman. It is a supplement to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996. We call it the Paperwork Elimination Act. What the bill does, in fine, is require that regulatory agencies give the people that they regulate, not just small businesses but everybody, the option to store and supply the information they have to supply by electronic means: modems, computers, faxes, where that is appropriate. This is done within the framework of the Paperwork Reduction Act, which we passed unanimously last year.

This bill itself passed the House last year unanimously, moved over to the Senate, was discharged from committee, but never reached the Senate floor. It came out of the Committee on Small Business unanimously. It is supported by the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], and myself. It is a good bill and a good step forward in trying to provide some additional options to people who are trying to supply information to the government in an efficient way at as little cost as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to encourage quick passage of H.R. 852, entitled the ''Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997.''

Paperwork demands of the Federal Government place a tremendous burden upon all Americans. Some estimates place the total burden at more than 6 billion hours a year. To place this staggering number in perspective, 6 billion hours of labor is equivalent to 3 million employees working full-time to satisfy the often repetitive and duplicative requests of various Federal agencies. This is a expense which small business can ill afford.

According to a 1995 study by Thomas Hopkins of the Rochester Institute of Technology, small businesses with less than 20 employees pay an average of $5,106 per employee annually in regulatory costs. This is in strong contrast to the average of $3,404 in regulatory costs per employer which businesses with more than 500 employees pay. Much of this regulatory cost stems from paperwork—paperwork which this legislation intends to eliminate.

The Paperwork Elimination Act builds upon the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 to further minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses and others. H.R. 852 would accomplish this by advancing the use of alternative information technologies including electronic maintenance, submission, and disclosure of information. Essentially, this would mean that anyone with access to a personal computer or even a phone would be able to meet the Federal Government's information requests in an easier and less timely fashion.

It is important to note that the Paperwork Elimination Act requires Federal agencies to provide for only the optical use of alternative technologies in complying with informational demands. This legislation should not in any way be construed as a mandate on individuals. Those without the ability or desire to comply with Federal regulatory demands electronically would not be required to do so against their will.

H.R. 852 is identical to legislation passed by the House in the 104th Congress. In the last Congress, after a thorough hearing by the Small Business Subcommittee on Government Programs, our committee adopted this measure by voice vote and the House went on to pass it unanimously. Unfortunately, even though this measure was discharged by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Senate was not able to take final action before the close of the 104th Congress. After consulting with Mr. LAFALCE, our ranking member, we decided that we could move this legislation through committee without the need for an additional hearing. The committee held a mark-up on this legislation last Thursday, March 6. We reported this measure out unanimously by voice vote without amendment, and filed our report later that day.

In conclusion, let me commend many out there for moving into the information age with such great speed and enthusiasm. I have observed businesses of all sizes eagerly accepting and embracing all forms of new technology. No office seems complete these days without a computer and fax machine. Products are being advertised, orders being taken, bills being paid, all by electronic means. Why should the Federal Government be any different?

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 852, the Paperwork Elimination Act.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that control and duration of time for general debate was set by order of the House, meaning essentially 30 minutes per side. While the previous request in the Committee of the Whole is not controlling, under the circumstances, however, the Chair notes that each side may yield back any time that they may desire.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. McCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 852, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997, which the Committee on Small Business reported out unanimously last week. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor.

In approving this legislation, the Committee on Small Business, which has long been a forum for and a voice of the small business community, took another step forward, responding to one of the principal ongoing concerns of small business owners: the paperwork burdens imposed on them by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the ambitious title of the legislation notwithstanding, I do not foresee a day in my lifetime when we will eliminate paperwork. Nor do I foresee the day when we will altogether eliminate regulations. What we can do, however, and what this bill does, is take advantage of existing technology capabilities and ease the regulatory burden on small businesses by reducing the amount of paper they must fill out, mail, and file.

This legislation itself imposes no burden. It has no mandates. It allows those small business owners, educators, State and local governments and others the option of communicating with the Federal Government via computer.

Mr. Chairman, I see much progress and no problems accompanying this bill, and therefore I urge all of my distinguished colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO.]

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I would like to point out that according to the Small Business Administration, small business owners spend at least 1 billion, that is right, 1 billion hours a year in filling out government forms, at an annual cost of $100 billion.

As someone who has spent more than 25 years in a small business, I can testify to the accuracy of this statistic. I spent more than my fair share of time filling out form after form after form. The paperwork required by the Government was seemingly endless. The Paperwork Elimination Act will alleviate the paper burden by giving small business owners and employees the option to submit information by electronic means.

Over the last several years, we have seen historic changes in the field of telecommunications. This bill will bring the Government into the information age. Many small businesses already take advantage of various technologies used for communication. This initiative would give businesses the option to use this technology to submit information to the Government. If it does not have the capability or the desire to exchange information electronically, if a business does not want to do that, they will not be penalized under this bill.

I hope the days of filling out forms in triplicates will be behind us. Passing this bill will be a giant step closer to that end.

In the last Congress, this legislation passed the House of Representatives with unanimous support but it never saw action on the Senate floor. In this session I hope we can put this bill on the President's desk, and I urge all of my colleagues to strongly support the legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to praise the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], the new chairman of the Committee on Small Business, and all the members of the Committee on Small Business, especially the freshman members on both sides, for the great work they have done so far.

I call upon everyone to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and as a cosponsor of the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997, introduced by my good friend and the chairman of the Small Business Committee, Congressman JIM TALENT.

Last year the Congress passed and the President signed the Paperwork Reduction Act, which mandates fixed percentage cuts in paperwork burdens over the next few years. The Paperwork Elimination Act builds on that law by encouraging the electronic submission and disclosure of regulations and submission of information for regulatory compliance.

This legislation is easy to extol as all affected parties are a winner. It urges the Federal Government to disseminate and receive information by computer where appropriate. As this involves putting already existing technology to better use, the Government will incur little, if any, additional administrative or financial cost to comply with the provisions of this legislation.

Small businesses, nonprofits, and State and local governments stand to gain because they may, if they choose, comply with Federal requirements for information by furnishing it electronically rather than on paper. If this serves to reduce paperwork storage and compliance time, then the burden of the small business owner and others becomes a bit lighter.

In the last several years on the Hill we have seen in our own offices an amazing increase in our reliance on computers and other forms of information transmission and storage. We have seen our ability to communicate become faster and more efficient. It is time we take the next logical step and prod Federal agencies to open the door to electronic communication with the businesses, States and towns of America. The Paperwork Elimination Act is the next logical step.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, in my office and in offices throughout our country, e-mail has become an alternative and efficient way for people in one office and different offices to transfer information. Within minutes of sending a message, memo, or document, a recipient in the next office, or someone who is five States away, receives information. It is quick, easy, and it saves paper.

The technological advances of our Nation have changed the face of doing business, whether it is using e-mail, having a WEB site, or even teleconferencing businesses are taking advantages of these technological advances in order to speed up the transfer of information.

By passing the Paperwork Elimination Act, the Federal Government can use these new advances in technology to reduce the burden on many small businesses. The Government can receive, disseminate, and respond to inquiries, input information, and save thousands of pieces of paper by implementing these new advances. The 104th Congress took a giant step forward in reducing the burdensome paperwork that consumes many businesses by passing the Paperwork Reduction Act. The 105th Congress has an opportunity to build on that and pass the Paperwork Elimination Act.

□ 1715

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCRELL].

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time. I commend her efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The Paperwork Elimination Act is an excellent piece of legislation. I believe it will enjoy overwhelming bipartisan support. The importance of small businesses in New Jersey cannot be emphasized enough. They are the backbone of the State's economy. Of the 187,000 full-time business firms in New Jersey, 98 percent are small businesses, which are independent businesses with fewer than 500 workers. The aim of this act is to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork on small businesses through the use of electronic information technology.

To use an extreme example, some small businesses are required to file forms with up to 50 different Federal, State and local agencies. This is impossible. These bureaucratic demands can strangle a small business. This bill ameliorates this burden by requiring all Federal agencies to provide the option of electronic submission of information to all those who must comply with Federal regulations. I believe it will accomplish the goal that is set out in the summary of the bill.

Small businesses play too significant of a role in our economy. We need job creation. We need productivity, and we need expansion. I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 852.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SNOWBARGER].

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

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, with that provision let me make just two points in the interest of time. First of all, I am very much supportive of any efforts on the part of agencies to allow electronic submission to take advantage of both efficiency and economy that is allowed by electronic submissions.

The second point I would like to make, however, is we must make sure that the legislative history is clear on this, that this is the option of the small business and governments that this is meant to provide some relief for and it is not at the option of the agency.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997. This legislation provides an option to small businesses and others, who have the capacity to comply with regulations by computer and other means, to take advantage of electronic technology. This is an effort to make it easier and less costly to do business with the Government, and I would encourage Government agencies to improve their effectiveness in utilizing information technology. I would like to point out that OMB is required to oversee and promote the use of electronic information technology.

However, we should make it very clear that the use of electronic technology is optional on the part of those required to comply with Government paperwork mandates. I support this legislation that will enable small businesses to cut down the billion or so hours they spend each year filling out Government forms, and, hopefully, lower their costs of $100 billion.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

I would first of all like to compliment our ranking member, from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] and our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT]. If there is anything that we have been talking about over the last couple months, it is bipartisanship. This bill is probably the best example of what anybody could call bipartisan legislation. It is here today. It may be small. But it is indeed the first effort that we have seen in this Congress of a bipartisan piece of legislation, so I compliment them both.

As a former small business owner, Mr. Chairman, I, like many of our colleagues, was besieged with Federal paperwork, working nights and weekends, taking time away from my family and my clients to be able to fill in those forms. This act will help change that.

More importantly, one of the things that we have heard in this Congress time and time again is that we must teach our children about computers and being more literate in that electronic field. This now forces us to also recognize the Federal Government must be literate in that area. It forces them to be on the state of the art in terms of technology. It forces us to finally get into the 21st century. It is a great piece of legislation. It may be small, but it moves us in the right direction, not only for businesses but for a bipartisan Congress. I hope Members will all support it.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I first of all would like to commend and congratulate Chairman TALENT AND THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK [MR. LAFALCE], the ranking member, for the exemplary leadership that they provided in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I want to concur and agree with the words that have already been spoken by most of my colleagues and would simply echo their sentiments. But I would like to add that I hope that in the implementation of this act that even those businesses that we call micro businesses, the ma and pa shops, the cleaners, the beauty shops, the barber shops, those that do not even have computers, I would hope that the legislation would be implemented in such a way that there would be a facility someplace that they could go and receive assistance so that they, too, could benefit from this legislation.

I think it is an excellent display of bipartisanship, and I hope that we can display in the near future the same kind of bipartisanship, the same kind of concern for campaign finance reform so that the people of this country can have the same assurances that small businesses will have, that they will get the most from their government.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank all the speakers for their kind words about the bill and about the process. I do need to thank some other people, Mr. Chairman, very briefly. The Committee on Small Business shares jurisdiction over issues involving paperwork reduction with the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman, and his staff for agreeing to waive their primary jurisdiction over the legislation. I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], a member of the Committee on Small Business who in his role as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, has along with his staff also assisted greatly in helping us move this measure forward in a speedy fashion.

I would also like to thank our ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], for his help in moving the bill through the committee at information age speed. It could not have been done without him. I would also like to thank the Committee on Small Business staff who worked on the legislation: Jeff Polich, Emily Murphy, Laurie Rains, and Harry Katrichis for the majority, and Patricia Hennessey and Tom Powers for the minority.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 852, the Paperwork Reduction Act. This bill is an important step into the technological age.

H.R. 852 will allow businesses to choose to submit required information to the Government by electronic filing. It will benefit businesses by allowing them to use the most efficient means available to communicate with the Government.

H.R. 852 brings both business and government into the modern age where information is transferred quickly and efficiently through the electronic medium. In so doing, it has the important effect of conserving resources—both human and material—and eliminating waste.

In the 104th Congress, we recognized the merits of H.R. 852 and voted unanimously in favor of similar legislation. Our colleagues in the Senate, however, did not act. I hope that in this new session, the House and Senate will stand together in support of this important legislation. However, as we work to reduce paperwork—a real discussion on campaign finance reform, should become a part of the House agenda. That is a necessary part of this body's work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 852, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997. This is important legislation that will assist in the process of lowering the paperwork burden that the Federal Government places on small businesses throughout this country, and will facilitate Federal agencies' efforts to fulfill their requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

We all know that the Federal Government places an enormous paperwork burden on small business owners. The amount of forms that it requires to be maintained or submitted is staggering.

One study that was conducted by the General Accounting Office estimates the Government-wide paperwork burden to be 7 billion hours per year.

Because of this burden that it creates, the Federal Government has an obligation to make compliance with these demands as easy and straightforward as possible. That is what the Paperwork Elimination Act is designed to address. It simply states that the Federal Government should recognize the advancements in information technology management that have been made in recent years, and allow small business owners to utilize them when meeting the demands that the Government makes.

As chair of the Small Business Committee's Regulatory Reform and Paperwork Reduction Subcommittee, I constantly hear from small business owners across the country who are desperate for additional paperwork relief. As a former small business owner, I know first hand and can testify to the demands that paperwork and recordkeeping can place on the busy schedule of those trying to successfully operate their own business. H.R. 852 simply provides an additional tool for these individuals to have at their disposal.

The one other important aspect of this legislation that I would like to highlight today is the flexibility it provides small business. While requiring that Federal agencies accommodate alternative information technologies, these amendments to the Paperwork Reduction Act leave the decision of employing such technologies squarely in the hands of the small business owner. We did not need another mandate from the Government telling small businessmen and women how they must comply. Rather, we need to give them the option of deciding the best way in which they can meet the requirements placed upon them.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] for introducing this legislation. As we all know, this bill overwhelmingly passed this Chamber during the 104th Congress. I would like to urge all Members

to support H.R. 852 and help make this important legislation become law.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by section. Each section shall be considered as having been read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Paperwork Elimination Act of 1997''.

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 nonprofit 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 FUNCTIONS 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 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 appropriate, 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, 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8 or to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, 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. 852) 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 88, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LAFALCE. 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 395, nays 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Bishop	Canady
Ackerman	Blagojevich	Cannon
Aderholt	Bliley	Capps
Allen	Blunt	Cardin
Andrews	Boehlert	Carson
Archer	Boehner	Castle
Armey	Bonilla	Chabot
Bachus	Bonior	Chambliss
Baesler	Bono	Chenoweth
Baldacci	Borski	Christensen
Ballenger	Boswell	Clement
Barcia	Boyd	Clyburn
Barr	Brady	Coble
Barrett (NE)	Brown (FL)	Coburn
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Collins
Bartlett	Bryant	Combest
Bass	Bunning	Condit
Bateman	Burr	Conyers
Bentsen	Burton	Cook
Bereuter	Buyer	Cooksey
Berry	Calvert	Costello
Bilbray	Camp	Cox
Bilirakis	Campbell	Coyne

Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—37

Baker
Barton
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Callahan
Clay
Clayton
Dicks
Etheridge
Everett
Gallegly
Hyde
John
Johnson (CT)
Kingston
Klug
Largent
Manton
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
Meehan
Nethercutt
Ortiz
Price (NC)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Sanchez
Schaefer, Dan
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Young (FL)

□ 1743

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, please let the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 50.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my friend from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] about the schedule for the remainder of the week and for next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. My good friend, the minority whip, I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that we are pleased to announce the House has completed its work for the week and there will be no more votes today or for the rest of the week.

The House will next meet at 2 p.m. on the infamous day of Monday, March 17; I think some others than the Scotch that I am would refer to that as St. Patrick's Day; for a pro forma session. Of course there will be no legislative business and no votes on that day.

On Tuesday, March 18, we will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members should note that any recorded votes will be postponed until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, March 18.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we hope to consider the following five bills under suspension of the rules. They are:

H.R. 924, the Victim Allocution Clarification Act of 1997; H.R. 927, the U.S. Marshals Improvement Act; H.R. 672, a bill containing technical amendments to copyright laws; H.R. 908, a bill to establish a commission on structural alternatives for the Federal Court of Appeals, and H.R. 514, a bill to permit the waiver of D.C. residency requirements for certain employees of the office of the D.C. Inspector General.

Also on Tuesday, March 18, the House will consider under an open rule H.R. 412, the Oroville-Tonasket Claims Settlement Act; that is under an open rule.

The House will meet for legislative business at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, March 19, and at 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 20. We plan to take up the following measures, all of which will be subject to rules:

H.R. 1, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 1997; H.R. 929, a bill to ban partial-birth abortions, and H.Res. 91, a resolution providing amounts for the expenses of certain House committees for the 105th Congress.

We hope to conclude business and begin the spring district work period by 6 p.m. on Thursday, March 20, and I would thank the gentleman for yielding to me to explain this to the membership.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his explanation. I have just a couple of questions I would like to pose to him if he would indulge me for a second here.

On Tuesday H.R. 412, the bill that follows the suspension, the Oroville-Tonasket Claim Settlement Act; that is under an open rule on the floor. Does the gentleman from New York expect to complete that bill on Tuesday?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, we do.

Mr. BONIOR. So it could be into the evening on Tuesday?

Mr. SOLOMON. I do not expect we would go—that is not a very controversial bill, and I would expect we would be out sixish or even sooner perhaps.

Mr. BONIOR. Just so that the gentleman is aware, there is opposition to it on our side of the aisle, and I just want the gentleman——

Mr. SOLOMON. I know of one significant amendment that we discussed in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BONIOR. So it may take a while and Members might be apprised that it may run a little bit beyond 6 o'clock. I just want the gentleman to know that.

And on Wednesday and Thursday, 19 and 20, my colleague mentioned the three bills. Does he know which day he is going to bring them up yet? H.R. 1?

Mr. SOLOMON. I say to the minority whip that he is a former member of the Committee on Rules and served there with me for many years. We expect to take up on the floor the Working Families Flexibility Act. It will be under a