

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Ms. FURSE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WARD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2127, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 208 is an open rule. It provides for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2127, which is the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Appropriations. However, I would hasten to add that I have been authorized by the Committee on Rules to offer an amendment to extend that general debate time from 1 hour to 2½ hours, plus 90 minutes each on the first three titles of the bill. That will total about 8 hours all together.

Mr. Speaker, the offering of that amendment was contingent on other arrangements being worked out between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. I will withhold that manager's amendment until the end of the rule, in hopes that we could get that unanimous consent worked out.

Mr. Speaker, following general debate, the rule first makes in order two manager's amendments printed in part 1 of the report. The amendments are not subject to amendment and are debatable for 10 minutes each. If adopted, they will become a part of the base text for further amendment purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for reading the bill by title rather than by paragraph, with each title considered as read. Members should go back and make sure they know where their amendments come up because of that.

The provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of House rule XXI are waived against provisions in the bill to protect the many unauthorized and legislative provisions in the bill. However, those provisions are subject to cutting and striking amendments under this open rule.

In addition to the regular amendment process, the rule makes in order three additional amendments contained in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report, and it waives points of order against them.

Mr. Speaker, the first of those amendments is by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] that restores \$193 million to the Title X Family Planning Program by transferring the funds from the maternal and child health block grant and migrant health centers.

The Greenwood amendment is subject to one amendment, and that is a substitute amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that would terminate funding for the Title X Family Planning Program and would transfer those funds back to the maternal and child health block grant and the migrant health centers.

Both the Greenwood amendment and the Smith substitute are subject to 30 minutes of debate each, divided equally between the proponent and the opponent.

Mr. Speaker, these two amendments are the product of many, many hours of negotiations. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] sat through many of them last night between the various parties on both sides of this very controversial issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend our leadership, and all the Members who did participate in those negotiations, for their good-faith efforts to bring this to a successful conclusion.

The other amendment specifically made in order in part 2 of the committee report is an amendment by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], myself, and a group of others on a bipartisan basis. That amendment establishes a deficit reduction lockbox law that would apply to this and all future appropriation bills.

That amendment is not subject to amendment and is debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided between the proponent and the opponent.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased with the amendment, since it is the product of the leadership of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] and a bipartisan group of Members to develop a workable lockbox law that will lock in savings made in the appropriations process for reducing the deficit.

Included in that group of bipartisan Members are the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN] on the Democrat side, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], the

gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] on the Republican side, and a number of others.

The Committee on Rules has also reported this as a separate bill, H.R. 1162, that we hope to take up on the floor later this fall. So, Mr. Speaker, we will go in a tandem route where we will have not only a bill working its way through Congress, but we will have this amendment attached to this appropriation bill working its way through Congress as well.

□ 1100

That was a commitment that was made to Members who support this, and we are fulfilling that commitment today. In the meantime, this amendment to the Labor-HHS bill will ensure that from now on we will utilize this process.

We are especially grateful to the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Committee on Appropriations for all of their assistance and support in producing this consensus approach to the lockbox. I would be remiss if I did not especially single out the Committee on Rules Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], sitting next to me over here, who was so instrumental in negotiating this bipartisan compromise, and finally we would commend our leadership on its commitment to bring this amendment forward today on this bill and for having an open mind on the concept while it was being developed.

I think we have once again proved this Congress is a reform Congress and that the reform process did not end on opening day but rather is an ongoing process, as well it should be.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HHS-Education bill has been a very, very difficult bill to fashion, given our new glide path towards a balanced budget in the next 7 years. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], are to be commended on working together to bring this bill to us today even though they obviously do not agree on all the particulars or priorities in the bill. But we do have the bill here on the floor.

In conclusion, this is a good rule because it is an open and a fair rule that will allow a majority of this House to work its will within the allocations made to this bill and its subcommittee. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to give their strong support for this rule.

The information referred to follows:

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

[As of August 1, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	41	72
Modified Closed ³	49	47	14	24
Closed ⁴	9	9	2	4
Totals	104	100	57	100

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of August 1, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a rule for a truly terrible bill. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a bill which decimates nearly every program that affects school children, the elderly poor, working men and women, and the most vulnerable in our society.

The committee has sent the House a bill which repeals family planning programs when at the same time the Con-

gress has under consideration legislation which will effectively penalize unwed teenage mothers. The Appropriations Committee has sent a bill to the floor which reaches so far into the social safety net that it even cuts the President's request for Head Start by \$500 million. And, while all of us certainly agree that there are many governmental programs which may be duplicative or unnecessary, the Appropriations Committee—not the legislative committees with jurisdiction—has sent us a bill which terminates 270 Federal programs.

And, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, this appropriations bill can hardly stand on its own by virtue of the fact that it is so loaded with legislative provisions. My friends in the majority party have often used the name of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher, to make points in debate; today, let me invoke that fine gentleman's memory to make a point. This bill contains pages and pages and pages of unauthorized provisions, but worse yet, contains page after page of legislative matters that are in blatant violation of the rules of the House. Mr.

Natcher was chairman of the Labor/HHS Subcommittee for 15 years and he never came to the Rules Committee to request such a waiver for one of his bills. Mr. Speaker, in my experience I have never seen such a mean spirited piece of legislation and I am sure that Mr. Natcher, were he with us here today, would agree wholeheartedly with me.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so bad it cannot be fixed. I believe the Appropriations Committee should take this bill back, reallocate some of its scarce resources and preserve and protect the programs that have fought illiteracy, protected workers at their jobs, ensured a decent life for those elderly Americans who were not as fortunate as others, and provided opportunities for countless Americans to secure a place in the middle class through education and training.

Mr. Speaker, surely this is not what the American people voted for last November. Surely, the goodness and generosity that characterizes this Nation and all Americans does not condone a bill which abandons those in our society who have only a small or perhaps no voice here in Washington. I think not, Mr. Speaker.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to withdraw this terrible bill. We should not, we cannot, pass legislation that attacks children, women, the elderly, the disabled, and working men and women. I urge defeat of the bill.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me. I must commend him for his patience, persuasion, and persistence in seeking a reasonable compromise on the host of highly contentious issues that pervade the Labor-HHS and Education appropriations bill. As Members know, while the bats were swinging in Bowie, MD last night for the congressional baseball game, our Rules Committee and Members on all points of the political spectrum were at work in the Capitol seeking common ground on the terms of debate for this bill.

Some might call this bill the "mother of all appropriations bills" since it covers a tremendous scope of topics and allocates more than \$60 billion. The sticking points have become highly visible sore thumbs—including the extraordinarily difficult issue of Federal funding for abortion. This rule does about the best it can do to allow for a relatively free and fair debate on the major issues—while keeping within a somewhat manageable timeframe. I am particularly pleased that this rule makes in order a lockbox amendment offered by Mr. CRAPO. This much-discussed and long awaited amendment

commits the House to ensuring that savings agreed to on the floor of the House will indeed be used for deficit reduction and will no longer be permitted to be spent on other spending projects.

We have worked hard to translate this seemingly simple concept into a workable procedural device—one that can accomplish its mission without derailing the entire appropriations process. I think we have done it—and we did so in a bipartisan and deliberative way. Sure, many of us would have preferred that we reach this point sooner in the process. But I am convinced it was better to do lock-box right the first time.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a long debate ahead of us on a host of important subjects. I urge support for this rule.

I hope to have a dialog with Chairman BLILEY on the subject of local land use and local ability to earn revenues in the utilities area and some other things as we go along in this and other legislation. There are many things ahead of us in the days ahead.

This is an important appropriations bill. This is a good rule. It is going to get the full debate it deserves. I urge support for this rule so we can get on with our debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I am of a split mind on this rule because this bill is so bad. But I guess what I would say is I would like us to pass this rule so that we can just as quickly as possible get to a vote on final passage so we can vote "no."

I said earlier, when this bill came out of committee, that in my view this bill was the meanest and the most vicious and the most extreme attack on the children of this country, on the dignity and the rights of workers, and on many of our most vulnerable citizens that I ever seen produced by the Committee on Appropriations in all of the years I have had the privilege to serve in this House. I do not believe this bill is fixable.

The basic problem with this bill is that earlier in the year the majority party adopted a budget. And under that budget what is called the 602 allocation was made by the committee, which decided how much would go to each department of Government, and this subcommittee is operating under constraints imposed by those 602 budget limitations. That means that even though the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who is the subcommittee chairman, and in my view one of the finest Members of this House, even though I am sure he would have liked to have done otherwise, he could simply not, under the conditions in which he was operating, produce a bill which meets our national obligations to our children, our workers, and the most vulnerable among us.

The bill also continues 17 major changes in authorization law, and each

of those changes ought to be considered on their own by the committee of jurisdiction. They should not be slipped in as legislative riders in this bill so that the authorizing committees can avoid confronting not only the language that you have for each of these provisions, but also confronting rational amendments to them.

Under the way we work, the way the House governs appropriations bills, or the way the House rules govern appropriation bill consideration, you cannot offer many rational amendments to the extreme language which is in this bill, and because that language makes a wholesale assault on the ability of workers to expect even a reasonable degree of protection and dignity at the bargaining table, because it imposes a set of values on women of this country rather than trying to encourage a set of values, I think that this is a highly illegitimate process, and so I think the bill ought to go down.

But the rule does facilitate our ability to at least address each of these issues in a rational way.

With the amended suggestions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], it will be a rational way in which we can focus the debate on education, on what we are doing to workers, on what we are doing to the seniors, and we will have an opportunity to at least debate in some fashion the legislative language which has illegitimately been attached to this bill, in my view, so I think the rule is far more legitimate than the bill which has spawned it.

So I would urge Members to vote for the rule, and I would ask the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle in helping us to focus the debate on each of these subjects without getting into the constant repetitive offering of individual amendments. This bill is so bad it cannot be fixed by amendment.

The key vote on this, in the end, will be the vote that occurs on final passage.

So I would urge Members of both sides of the aisle to vote for this rule, but when we move on to the bill itself, I would urge Members of both parties who recognize that this is an extreme attack on the education of children, the rights of workers, the rights of women, and the needs of the most vulnerable in our society, to join me in voting against the bill on final passage.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The truth of the matter is that this is a very controversial bill, and in the first three titles we have, at his suggestion, increased the general debate time for each of those three titles. As a matter of fact, 1½ hours each, and that does then lay the groundwork for what is in those titles.

So I want to commend him for his suggestions and for helping us to get this rule through here today.

Having said that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], the very distinguished vice-chairman of the Committee on Rules. He was the Chair of the task force, Speaker's task force, that brought about on opening day major changes in this institution that are now coming to fruition, and we are finally able to process legislation the way it should have been. We still have far to go.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is still concentrating on that, and he has been very helpful in this lockbox legislation that is going to be in this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me this time. I hope the time he used to introduce me does not come out of such time as I may consume.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that our former colleague, Dan Rostenkowski, used to always say that if everyone is unhappy with a piece of legislation, it is probably a pretty good bill.

We do not always say that when we are looking at a rule, but we know that it took a great deal of negotiation to get to the point where we are today, and as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has just said, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations did have input in determining the time for general debate that was added for these three titles, and virtually everyone has had a hand in this.

If you look at the very beneficial aspects, I believe that it should lead a majority of Members of this institution to support this rule.

Now, one of the items that has been discussed in a bipartisan way consistently has been the lockbox, the desire to deal with deficit spending, and Members on both sides of the aisle again have stepped up and said, "We need to deal with the issue of the deficit." We have had very strong statements made by our colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] consistently before our Committee on Rules on that, and, of course, we have had Members on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], and others who have been dealing with the issue of the lockbox. This rule allows us to finally face that question.

□ 1115

Then we look at a number of the other items. Well, it has been stated time and time again the legislation that deals with the Departments of Health and Human Services, and Labor, clearly is an overwhelmingly large bill, and there are many items in it, but it seems to me that it is our responsibility to deal, as well as we can, with them, and this rule, while it may

not be perfect, is, quite frankly, the best product that can be assembled.

I am disappointed that things like the Riggs amendment were not made in order that would allow us to deal with the issue of illegal immigration, and I can point to other aspects of it that I believe should have been addressed. But we need to move forward.

This is an extraordinarily important appropriations bill, and I hope very much that our Members will come to the conclusion that providing support for this rule will at least allow us to consider this very important legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, although touted by the good chairman of the Committee on Rules, as exemplifying yet another instance of reform in this place, really is belied in that regard. It is yet another example of cover and camouflage with which we have buried in an appropriations bill 13 pages of the most egregious, wrong-headed legislative language imaginable. Why in the world, Mr. Speaker, this was protected from a point of order is beyond me, but it is. And it should offend everyone's sense of regular order around this place that without any hearings, without any examination in the normal order of business, we would be putting a bill, an entire bill, dealing with a topic as sensitive as Government restrictions on political activity in this country, putting an entire bill into this appropriations measure. If for no other reason, not withstanding the reasons that have been outlined by the gentleman from Wisconsin for going ahead with this rule, we ought to seriously consider defeating it because of its protection of this provision. Nonetheless, we will have an opportunity, which I hope my colleagues will avail themselves of probably tomorrow, to get rid of this travesty, this frontal, headlong assault on first amendment protected activities in this country.

In any case I wanted my colleagues to be aware of what's probably the singular waiver event of this Congress in protecting the nonsense in this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, this rule makes it far too easy for the Republican majority to target children, seniors, and working families with these cuts. What we are seeing is a finalization, I guess, of the budget resolution we passed here earlier that required this bill to have these substantial cuts in education, senior programs, and for children programs and for working families.

Let me talk about the education cuts since I serve on that committee here in

Congress. This bill that this rule will allow us to consider will cut 48,000 children from Head Start programs, cut the Healthy Start in half, it cuts the Safe and Drug Free Schools by 59 percent, it cuts 1 million children that will not get extra help on their reading and math thanks to the 17-percent cut in chapter 1. In my State of Texas we will lose \$66 million on summer jobs programs that we restored this summer, but this appropriations bill will not allow it for the summer of 1996, and that is what is wrong with this bill. Chapter 1 funding; it goes to almost every elementary school in my district in the State of Texas, will be cut \$97 million. There are school districts, particularly in poorer parts of Texas and all over the country, who depend on that to provide that extra help for these children who need that extra assistance.

Senior citizens' programs are cut in this bill. The programs that we have to provide heating assistance in the winter and cooling assistance in the summer are being cut. Take, for example, what has happened in Chicago this last month or what was happening in Texas up until we had the tropical storm come through, Mr. Speaker. Twelve million meals served to seniors each year are eliminated by cuts in Meals on Wheels and meals that are served in senior citizens' centers that all of us have in all of our districts.

Working families; let me talk about the cuts in just the labor side of it. Working families, the cuts; now we may all agree that we need to look at OSHA and a lot of Federal programs, but to cut 33 percent off of job safety is ridiculous, and cut the pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk all day, as my colleagues know, and I appreciate my colleagues' courteousness, and I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding this time to me, and, as my colleagues know, in 2 minutes I just cannot say enough bad things about this bill.

People are wearing these shame lapels because we are really ashamed to be here. The ranking member said over and over again this is the meanest and the most extreme bill we have ever seen. We are picking on people that rally cannot fight back.

I ask my colleagues, "Are you proud today if what we will be doing is kicking 48,000 children out of Head Start? Does that make anybody proud? Is anybody proud today that we're going to cut Healthy Start for infants and children in half?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not make me proud.

Is there anybody proud that we are going to take Safe and Drug Free School funds and cut them by 60 percent?

Or how about gutting title I, which is where we try and bring children's reading skills up to snuff?

What about the whole area of protecting our workers, and their pension programs, and all the things that we have been doing?

Or what about what we are doing to seniors?

As I say, this list goes on, and on, and on, and I am ashamed because at the very same time we are gutting all of this we are going to be backing right up to this bill a Defense Department bill where we are going to give the Pentagon \$8 billion more than they asked for, \$8 billion more than they asked for. We have never done that. We cannot buy enough B-2's, and apparently we cannot buy enough hardware and all this stuff when they do not even want it, and yet we are saying to little kids, 3-year-olds, out of Head Start, we do not have the money. We are saying to people in Healthy Start get out, we do not have the money for them to have a healthy start.

Mr. Speaker, those are not the priorities for America's future.

I am surprised that the leadership of this House who keeps talking about the third wave, and their vision, and all of that; if their vision does not include children, if their vision does not include middle-class families, we are in real trouble. Their vision is a horror show.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

PERMISSION FOR CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO POSTPONE VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2127

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of H.R. 2127 pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 208, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LIMITING TIME FOR DEBATE ON AMENDMENTS AND LIMITING MOTIONS FOR COMMITTEE TO RISE DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2127

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of the bill H.R. 2127 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 208 shall also be governed by the following order:

The following amendments, identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause

6 of rule XXIII, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, if offered by the Member designated: the amendment by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin numbered 36; and an amendment en bloc by Representative PELOSI of California consisting of the amendments numbered 60, 61, and 62.

The time for debate on each of the following amendments to the bill, identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII, unless otherwise specified, and any amendments thereto shall be limited to 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment to the bill and an opponent: the amendment by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin numbered 36; the amendment by Representative STOKES of Ohio numbered 70; the amendment by Representative LOWEY of New York numbered 30; the amendment by Representative KOLBE of Arizona proposing to strike section 509 of the bill; the amendment by Representative SKAGGS of Colorado numbered 64; the amendment by Representative SABO of Minnesota or Representative OBEY of Wisconsin proposing to amend title VI of the bill; and the amendment by Representative SOLOMON of New York relating to the subject of political advocacy.

Except as otherwise specified in House Resolution 208, the time for debate on each other amendment to the bill and any amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment to the bill and an opponent.

After a motion that the committee rise has been rejected on a day, the chairman may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the majority leader or their designee. After a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill, as described in clause 7 of rule XXIII, has been rejected, the chairman may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the concern I have is the preclusion of Members offering a motion for the Committee to rise because this is one of the few opportunities where member of the committee, where there are time controls, have any access to get heard.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of controversy on this bill on both sides of the aisle, and I have got to tell my colleagues that if we are going to preclude Members like myself from moving that the Committee rise so that we might be heard for 5 minutes, it is something to which at this point I would object.

Can we delete that section from the motion?

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Let me point out that the language on that was specifically requested by the gentleman's party leadership.

Mr. GUNDERSON. It does not get any better.

Mr. OBEY. I was most reluctant to agree to it because I think it can put them procedurally in the driver's seat, but in the end I was persuaded to accept it on two grounds.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my concern is that we are going to enter into a whole series of time agreements to expedite business over the next couple of days. I understand that, and I respect that, but, if we have time agreements, and the time is controlled, and we only allow one motion to rise during that day, then everybody else on the floor outside of the chairman and ranking member is precluded from getting heard if they feel strongly.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Let me explain the process under which we are going to proceed. I think it will alleviate the concerns of the gentleman.

What we are doing is we are starting with 2½ hours of general debate under the proposal that is being offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

□ 1130

We are trying to group debate so we can have a focused discussion title by title on Labor, on HHS, and on Education. We will also then have a focused discussion on a number of the language amendments. We have, for instance, the Istook amendment, the rape-incest provision, we have a number of those.

We have tried to structure a good deal of debate time so that Members on and off the committee will be able to participate. I know we certainly worked out a very large number of participants on this side of the aisle, and I would be very surprised if the gentleman from Illinois has not done the same thing.

So I, speaking as a Member of the minority who used that right the other night in order to make a point, I am very reluctant to give that up. If you ask the Speaker's representative, he will tell you we had a quite heated discussion on it. But I think the rights of Members to be able to participate meaningfully are being protected by the rule.

I do not have a dog in this fight. This is your leadership's request, but it is our efforts to try to accommodate them.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear that I need

to correct my own language. It is the motion to strike the enacting clause that I wanted to preserve, not the motion to rise, so everybody understands what I am trying to preserve here.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the motion to rise by the manager of the bill, the gentleman would be entitled to one motion to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, is it one per Member? For example, if the gentlewoman from Florida wanted to move to strike the enacting clause and get recognized for 5 minutes and that has been done, under this agreement do I have the right to strike the enacting clause?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, you would only have one between the two of you. But what is allowed, so that the gentleman may be heard, is that you are allowed to strike the last word at any time when an amendment is not pending. So one cannot be precluded from speaking for 5 minutes or even longer on their point of view. The gentleman is protected under this arrangement.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is the concern. The gentleman knows we are going to move to rather strict time debates. When we have amendments thereto, such as the Greenwood amendment and the Smith amendment thereto, and if I have Members here who feel strongly about this issue, myself or others, who want to be recognized, and we are told you only have 30 seconds under the time agreement, that is not acceptable.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. That means that any Member can simply offer another amendment and get time under the 5-minute rule to pursue it. I do not think anyone would be shut off from debate or further expressing themselves in any way they want.

We are trying, obviously, to pack a lot of work into the last few days before the August district work period, and this will simply allow us to expedite that work. I do not think it will cut off anybody's rights. I urge the gentleman to withdraw his reservation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman under all circumstances would be allowed 5 minutes by striking the last word. He might be precluded from an additional 2 or 3 or 5 minutes if someone objected to a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that people understand that members of the committee get recognized before anybody else. Second, we are doing things in this bill

that do not belong in the Committee on Appropriations or the appropriations bill. Third, we are going by strict time controls on the debate on most of these amendments.

What the gentleman is telling a Member like me, who is a member of the authorizing committee, who sees all of these things done that we have had no input on, who feels very strongly about the question of human investment, is that I am going to be controlled by somebody else's time agreement and whether they yield me time, and now the gentleman is going to take away from me the one opportunity I have during the course of that debate to make points I feel strongly about, which is the motion to strike the enacting clause.

I would plead with the gentleman, delete that, so I do not have to object. I would not get recognized. One would not be able to get recognized to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, under protocol and precedents of the House, the Speaker would recognize members of the committee first. Certainly in this case, with the authorizing committee being involved, I am sure that the gentleman's committee would come second in the eyes of the Speaker. The gentleman is protected.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, if we were to remove that last sentence of the request, would the gentleman then not object?

Mr. GUNDERSON. That is right.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last sentence of my earlier unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to make sure that is the sentence regarding striking the enacting clause?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] modifies his request. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I just wanted to pose a question to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. The gentleman listed several amendments on which there would be a 40-minute limitation on debate, including, I believe, one attributed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] on political advocacy.

My review of what is preprinted did not show such an amendment. Is this one that is yet to be drafted?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, apparently it is not preprinted. It was printed this morning.

Mr. SKAGGS. So it has been submitted and is available for review. It is that amendment that is contemplated by that 40-minute restriction?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply want to make sure I understand what has been suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. Is the gentleman in fact simply removing the last sentence?

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if that is satisfactory to the majority, we have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Illinois, as modified?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today in strong opposition to this rule.

This rule does not make in order an amendment offered by Mr. KOLBE, Ms. PRYCE, and myself, which would have provided a commonsense solution to the issue of Medicaid-funded abortions in the cases of rape and incest.

In 1993, the Hyde amendment, which was overwhelmingly supported by pro-life Members, included language allowing Medicaid-funded abortions in the cases of rape and incest. As we all know, Medicaid is funded jointly by the States and the Federal Government. Because some States prohibit funds from being used for rape and incest abortions, many States' laws are in conflict with the current Hyde language.

This bill includes a provision which attempts to remedy that situation by allowing States the option of not funding such abortions. While the bill protects States' rights, it would result in instances where a young woman who has become pregnant from rape or incest would have to travel across State lines to get a Medicaid-funded abortion.

The Kolbe amendment would solve the dilemma by maintaining States' rights not to fund such abortions, but would have the Federal Government cover the entire cost. Last year, there where only two—let me repeat that—only two Medicaid abortions because of rape or incest.

I do not support Federal funding of abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother. But I feel very strongly about those exceptions. As the mother of two daughters, it is horrifying to me to think of anyone's

daughter having to suffer the consequences of rape or incest without recourse. The Kolbe amendment was not radical and it was not about funding abortion on demand. It was a common-sense solution. But it was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

Under this rule, we have two choices: either we accept the bill language, or we move to strike the provision. While I do not support the current bill language, the motion to strike fails to address the problem of States' rights.

It is beyond me to understand why our leadership has a problem with an open debate on this issue and an up or down vote on the Kolbe-Pryce-Fowler amendment. I am extremely disappointed that our leadership has ignored Members' concerns and I am voting against this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I think if we want to get a clear view of the new priorities in Washington, we need to take a close look at this bill.

First of all, it is antieducation. Our educational system, which is the truest test of what we are and where we are going, is going to be cut nearly 20 percent in this bill. These cuts affect 14,000 school districts, and are going to deny 1 million children the help they need in reading and math.

Vocational programs, which are key to ensuring that young adults and children keep step with a rapidly changing economy, are cut by one-third. Apparently, we are willing to tell children who simply must have vocational programs to rise above the poverty line that they are expendable.

Head Start, one of the Nation's most successful preschool programs for 700,000 disadvantaged and disabled children, is a target for cuts. At least 48,000 children will no longer get the community-based health and education programs they need to do well in school.

Programs for the mentally ill, which are already underfunded, take a 20 percent cut. In this country, 63 million children suffer from mental disorders. Severe mental illness is more prevalent than cancer, diabetes, or heart disease, yet this vulnerable population is apparently not a priority.

Rural health programs that assist doctors, local hospitals, and migrant workers are no longer necessary or important by the cuts of this bill. Protection for workers, decimated. Each year, 55,000 people die and another 60,000 are permanently disabled on the job, but OSHA, the agency responsible for dramatically reducing worker injuries in the last 20 years, has been slashed rather drastically.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need to read between the lines with this appropriations bill. However, many of my constituents and working families all over

the country seem to be less of a priority now.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that we also recognize the damage to seniors. The low income energy assistance which provides heat in the winter and cooling in the summer for thousands of low income elderly people is totally eliminated. Twelve million meals served to seniors each year are eliminated by cuts in Meals on Wheels and meals served to senior centers.

I have already talked about Head Start. Healthy Start cut in half; safe and drug-free schools cut by 59 percent; 48,000 children eliminated from Head Start; 1 million children will not get the extra help they need in reading and math thanks to the 17 percent cut in title I education.

Again, as I mentioned, enforcement of health and safety protections in the workplace for working families is cut by 33 percent. Pension protection is cut. Enforcement of the minimum wage law, child labor laws, and the 40-hour week, is cut by 12 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill, and it should be defeated.

□ 1145

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Fullerton, CA [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on the Labor-HHS bill. In particular, I support the provision in the rule which permits the offering of an amendment by my colleague, Mr. CRAPO and myself, requiring that any savings realized in the bill from amendments either in committee or on the floor below the 602(b) budget allocation, be specifically earmarked for deficit reduction.

This is the so-called deficit reduction lockbox provision, which Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SOLOMON, and others, myself included, have supported and worked for in the past. The Speaker, our majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, and many of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle, especially Mr. BREWSTER, all support this provision, which will insure that any savings we make below the budget allocation for this bill will go directly to debt reduction, rather than for other programs.

I think this amendment is also supported by the American people, who deserve to know that we are working to reduce the national debt while still providing essential services. A child born today faces a tax bill of \$187,000 over his or her lifetime just to pay their share of interest on the national debt. I urge adoption of this rule, which will allow us to make sure our votes go to deficit reduction.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise because of the statement just made by the last speaker to simply point out that the lockbox provision being attached to this bill is a king-size joke.

All year we have tried to defend the right of Members to offer an amendment on lockbox which essentially would save any money that is cut during floor consideration of a bill and use that for deficit reduction. We objected to the rescissions bill earlier in the year because lockbox was blocked. But now cynically the lockbox provision is provided on this bill at the end of the process; the only problem is that there is not going to be any money to put in the box because this bill is already so decimated that I doubt seriously that the House is going to make any significant reductions in the bill.

All the lockbox amendment is is a cover-your-tail amendment that allows politicians to pretend that they are setting up a system to save money when, in fact, there will be no money to be saved the way this bill is being handled.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would also point out on the same subject of lockbox that in the Committee on Rules last night I offered an amendment to make lockbox provisions retroactive so in fact we could cover all the appropriation bills that have already been considered, but that was rejected by the committee. So the gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely right. This is a meaningless provision as it is currently offered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are considering a rule that is nothing more than a dastardly act perpetrated on the American people by the Republican Party, a bill so bad that it cannot be fixed by any number of amendments offered here in the next several hours.

The gaping wounds slashed into the heart of the programs by the Grand Old Party on our children's education, on our senior citizens, on training and protecting America's work force into the 21st century, and health programs cannot be healed by the Band-Aid approach that is taking place here.

Let us just let this bill bleed to death on the House floor. Make no mistake about it, the bill is a head-on assault on our future. It fundamentally goes in the opposition direction that our country needs to take. It targets the most vulnerable people in our society, and it yanks the safety net away from our seniors, rolls back protections for our workers and take away the opportunity for our children to learn.

It ends the fuel assistance program so key to the needs of our seniors and poor people in the middle of winter that ended up providing the assistance that was necessary right here in the summer where 700 people were killed in the last couple of weeks because of the heat wave. The Republicans want to cut it.

It kills the summer job programs for our Nation's youth, a program that is vital if we are going to end the kind of

violence that we see, the kind of despair that so many young people feel in our inner cities today. It cuts back on the Drug-free Schools Program by 60 percent.

It cuts \$1 billion out of the job training programs for our country. It cuts 50 percent out of the Healthy Start Program. There are parts of this country, parts of my district where we have worse infant mortality rates than the poorest countries in our hemisphere. The one program that works, it works, is Health Start, which dramatically brings down the infant mortality rates; the Republicans are going to cut it. It cuts back the opportunities for college education. It undermines the bargaining rights for the working people of our country.

It undermines the bargaining rights of working people. Somehow we are told that the Republicans, again, are not trying to enforce an authorizing provision in an appropriations bill. That is a lot of jargon around here, but basically what it means is they write laws when they are supposed to be appropriating money. It eliminates the striker replacement bill in this legislation.

What we have here is an attempt by Republicans to go about their business of trying to balance the budget, at the same time providing an enormous tax cut and going through the back door of undercutting and slashing the most vulnerable people in this country. I do not understand it. If we are really, truly considering the future needs of Americans, why go and hurt the most vulnerable people in this country? Why go after our children? Why go after our senior citizens? It just is not right.

Find some heart, find some conscience in what you are doing. Do not just be mean-spirited to line your pockets and the pockets of wealthy contributors today. Go after a more balanced approach in terms of finding the ways to balance the budget of this country. We can do it, but not in this mean-spirited way.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to just pound a question to everyone: What is compassionate about running up a huge Federal deficit that is literally going to rob my children, my grandchildren, my great-grandchildren and yours and everybody's in this room?

We have a Federal deficit today that is approaching \$5 trillion. When you look at the pie that makes up the Federal budget, about 16 percent of that pie goes to pay the interest, each year, on that Federal deficit that has now reached \$5 trillion.

If we continue down the path that was presented by the President, we would have added another trillion dollars to that. In other words, at the end of 5 years we would then have a \$6 trillion debt.

Do you know how much the interest is that we pay to foreign countries who own the Treasury notes that go to fi-

nance that debt? Now it is only \$250 billion, which is almost equal to what we spend on the first priority of our budget, national defense. The interest alone each year almost equals that national defense budget. If we continue down that path, then it will not be just \$250 billion that we pay out; it will be \$350 billion. That is an additional \$100 billion that has to be taken from the rest of the pie, which is national defense, which is discretionary programs, which is entitlement programs. You then have to deduct another \$100 billion from the money you currently spend on the truly needy in this country.

What is compassionate about that?

Now, we are not going to raise taxes another dollar. We are not going to do it. Because young people today, including my five children, find it difficult to save enough money for a downpayment on something that the gentleman spends so much fighting for on this floor, and that is the right for decent human beings to own their own home, not a public home, but their own home.

My children have difficulty saving enough money for that downpayment.

They would have more difficulty even if they did save that money to make the mortgage payments because interest rates are so high. We cannot let this deficit continue to burgeon, to continue to go up and up and up. Those interest rates go up and up and up, and young people today are not going to have the ability to do what we all wanted to do so much 45 years ago.

When I first got married, we scrimped and we saved and we had enough money because the Federal Government did not take that much out of our take-home pay. We were able to save a little bit. We were able to make those mortgage payments, and we suffered, but we did it. We cannot continue to be noncompassionate on those people today.

That is what we are talking about in this debate. Sure, it is tough. You have got to have cuts. But you have got to cut someplace. We have cut everywhere and it has been fair.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I stand second to no one in terms of being willing to cut the Federal budget. We have different priorities.

The fact of the matter is that when you say you cut everywhere, you put \$7.6 billion more into the equipment account of the military than they even asked for. You have lined the pockets of corporate America through the use of corporate welfare in this country, the likes of which we have never seen before in the Congress of the United States.

We have done things over the course of this budget by providing people with incomes above \$200,000 a year with a \$20,000-a-year tax break. I appreciate

the gentleman talking about the fact that he is interested in having his kids own a home. I wonder whether or not the gentleman might have taken advantage of the VA loan program when he got out of the military. I know that he served the country very well, but the fact is that he probably got some Government help and assistance when he needed to buy a home.

I do not know that for sure, but there is certainly a large number of veterans that have. All that I am trying to suggest is that there are ways to invest in our country's future, and there are ways to frivolously throw money around today. This bill cuts the very heart out of the poorest people, the senior citizens, fuel assistance, summer jobs for our kids, protections in our work force, which I think are a short-sighted way of going.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend, we can argue about the national defense budget. I recall when Captain O'Grady was shot down, and I recall how we were able to detect where he was and then go in there, stealthily, without a loss of one single American life, and bring him out. Do you know why? Because we have been able to maintain, since Ronald Reagan came in here in 1981, a decent research and development program in our military budget that allowed us to do that.

It allowed us to go into a place called Iraq with the fewest possible casualties. We were able to give the young men and women we put into the military the finest equipment in the world. And by God, if we ever put them in there again, and I hope it is not in Bosnia, they are going to go in with the very best.

Sure we increased procurement by 11 percent. We increased research and development by 5 percent, operation and maintenance by 3 percent to give them a decent place to live in the military. I could go on and on and on.

Minimal increases in the defense budget are necessary to guarantee that our military is going to be able to defend America's strategic interests around the world. That is what this debate is all about here, priorities and fairness.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the chair the time remaining on each side.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the last interchange between my colleague from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York indicates the problem that now faces the House. We are about to make the most important decisions a civilized democracy can make in about 2 days. We are

being told that we will appropriate the two largest amounts, the Defense Department appropriations bill and the Labor-Health and Human Services appropriations bill, totaling more than \$500 billion, more than \$300 billion discretionary, more than half of the discretionary account. Plus we will deal with the telecommunications future of this country in about 2 days. Nothing better illustrates the absolute incompetence with which the majority is now running the House.

This is not the fault of the Committee on Rules. They have been given an impossible job. We have heard Members on the other side, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentlewoman from Florida, objecting at the constricted nature of the debate that faces them. It happens because we have a Republican leadership that has so mishandled things that we come to 2 days before a recess, having taken time out for Republican fund raisers and other things, and we are told that we will go all night, if necessary, we will do the most fundamental decisions.

□ 1200

Yes, we will take money away from the poor and the needy and the elderly and give it to the B-2 bomber, and give it to defense. We will make all these decisions on American telecommunications.

There is a kind of a book that comes to mind. When the Mets played their first year, somebody wrote a book about the Mets and they quoted Casey Stengel as having said, as he looked at his team, "Can't anybody here play this game?" This is not a game, this is more serious; but can not anybody on this side run this House?

Mr. Speaker, to come to this late date, we have 2 days and 3 hours, 51 hours, 2 days and 3 hours to do the telecommunications bill, the Labor-HHS appropriation, and the Defense Department. This is not just incompetence, it becomes an abuse of democracy. If we were not cramming all this in so quickly we would have time to debate it adequately.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], he should have included the Democrat leadership in the incompetency that he mentioned, because they have conspired to limit the time for consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that last year we did Labor-HHS, DOD, and VA-HUD in 2 days. That was under the Democratic leadership of the Congress. That was a far bigger bite to take off than what the gentleman suggested that the Republican leadership has given. I just thought we ought to correct the record.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho

Falls, ID [Mr. CRAPO], a distinguished Member of this Congress. He is the father of lockbox, and boy, we are going to get this deficit spending under control because of people like him.

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

Mr. Speaker, before we talk about lockbox, I have to respond also. As a freshman last year, I remember many times when we wanted to have a lot of time when we wanted to debate a lot of bills pushed through here in a short time, sometimes in a matter of hours. For the arguments to be made here, I think we should look back and see what the practice has been in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I came to talk about a very critical issue, and I want to thank the Committee on Rules for making this in order, the lockbox amendment. We have been fighting now for close to 2 years to make one of the most important reforms in our budget process that we will address in this Congress. That is the lockbox.

I can still remember as a freshman in this Congress when I found that after we had fought on bill after bill, motion after motion, to reduce spending here and to pare spending down there and to try to bring control to our budget, all we had been doing was eliminating various programs or projects; but the money was still getting spent.

Why? Because we were just cutting the programs or projects, and what was happening to the money is it was simply unallocated. When it went into the conference committee, those in the conference committee sat down, pulled out special projects of their own interest or concern, put them back into the bill and used the unallocated money on those projects.

The reason it happens, Mr. Speaker, is because our budget system does not mandate that when we vote on this floor to cut budgets, that the cuts go to deficit reduction. That is what the lockbox will do. It will create a special deficit reduction lockbox account. When we in the House and Senate vote to reduce spending, the spending reductions, the money, in addition to the projects, the money will go into these lockbox accounts, and there will then be a corresponding reduction in our Federal deficit spending, as we end each bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical reform of our budget process, and I again thank our Committee on Rules for making it in order. I look forward to this evening's debate on this critical issue.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the charade being engaged in by the other side on the lockbox provision is really quite extraordinary. As a member of the Committee on Rules, I have offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules to every single appropriation bill up to this point, trying to get the lockbox provision added so we could vote on it, so we could have some savings.

The majority members of the Committee on Rules, day after day, bill after bill, rejected my amendment in the Committee on Rules, and only at this late date, with the final appropriation bill working its way through, did they deign to add the lockbox provision.

Mr. Speaker, the charade they are engaging in is extraordinary: crocodile tears. If they wanted this lockbox provision all they had to do was make it in order a month ago when I offered it to one of the other appropriation bills; but every time they rejected it, so we cannot take them seriously on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. I would like to respond to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, and agree with him on one point: that this bill is about priorities.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out by my colleagues earlier, this body voted for \$8 billion, roughly \$8 billion in additional spending to the defense budget that the President did not want, the Vice President did not want, the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not want, and the Pentagon said it did not need. However, in this budget we are slashing programs that are important to this Nation's children, seniors, and workers. We are slashing, really, programs that assist and help this Nation's cities.

Education cuts make up half of the cuts in the bill. Title I, which provides the extra support that millions of disadvantaged children need to get off to a good start, is slashed to ribbons. I represent portions of Manhattan, Queens, and Brooklyn. These counties will lose \$48 million in title I funding alone.

These are not just numbers, these cuts have real consequences. This bill will force thousands of New York City children, and children across this Nation who receive the extra push in reading and math that they need this year, to go it alone next year. That is not fair. Neither is the 60-percent cut in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, nor are the cuts that will eliminate thousands of Head Start slots across the Nation; the healthy start program; the job training and seniors programs. And the bill eliminates the summer jobs program. We are blocking young children from the path to learning, and young adults from the path to opportunity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot abide the outrageous assaults on a woman's constitutional right to reproductive freedom that are contained in this bill.

The Istook amendment, which would prevent States from using Medicaid funds to provide abortions in the case of rape and incest,

represents the rankest attack on or most vulnerable citizens.

This provision renders the right to choose meaningless since it denies women the means to choose. It must be stricken from the bill.

I also oppose the assault on title X funds. It is hard to understand why the new majority wants to cut a program that saves the Government \$5 for every dollar invested and that prevents half a million abortions each year.

Finally, the egregious language on accreditation standards for graduate medical education is an unwarranted back door attempt to advance the anti-choice agenda.

There is no place in this funding bill for wanton Government interference in residency requirements for obstetrics and gynecology.

The bill undermines the constitutional rights of women.

The bill will make it harder for women to stay healthy.

The bill decimates the programs that have proven most successful in educating our children.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, one reason Congress is held in such low esteem by the American people is because some politicians have a tendency to say one thing back home and then come down here and vote a different way. I would just ask the viewers of C-SPAN, maybe they want to write in for the National Taxpayers Union's list of big spenders. I have it here in front of me.

I hate to even bring this up with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], but he says he has fought for this lockbox time in and time out. We have to live by our voting record. The name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] appears here as one of the biggest spenders in the Congress, year in and year out. People ought to pay attention to this when they hear people on the floor get up and pretend to be fiscal conservatives. This will clarify the matter for the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would only point out to the gentleman on the other side that I have offered this amendment on every single appropriation bill, and the gentleman who holds himself out as the defender of the taxpayers has led the fight to prevent this amendment from being offered on every single appropriation bill up until this point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, previously Members on the other side said, "We did three appropriations bills in 2 days last year." There is a difference. Last year we did not have the systematic abuse of authorizing process. We did not have appropriations bills that preempted totally the authorizing process. We had a senior Republican from one of the authorizing committees today complaining about this.

Those three bills that only took 2 days last year all had completely open rules with no restriction, and they were done easily because they were appropriations bills, and they only dealt with the money. They did not, as this side did in VA-HUD this year. Try to rewrite and cripple EPA. They did not rewrite the legislation. What they have done is they have been unable to have the authorizing committees function. The Republicans control the authorizing committees, but they have not been able to get them to function. They have not been able to get them to function. They have, therefore, used the appropriations bills to a degree unprecedented in my experience as legislative vehicles, and then we run into this terrible problem. It is one thing to deal simply with the money. It is another to get into the degree of legislating that they have gotten into.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an absolutely terrible piece of legislation. This is a piece of legislation that the other side should be ashamed of. Quite the contrary, they seem to take great pride in cutting programs that affect women, cutting programs that affect children, cutting programs that affect the neediest in our society. This bill should be defeated, and I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the committee report on this bill. I would just point out to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], that in all of the bills that were brought before this House last year, all of the appropriation bills, all of them contained unauthorized and legislative language. All of them contained unauthorized programs.

As a matter of fact, let me just point out what will happen if this rule goes down. In this bill are literally dozens and dozens of programs, like the Older Americans Act, that have not been reauthorized. If we let this rule go down, there is going to be a heyday on this floor when we bring the bill back without a rule, and any Member can stand up, if you are a conservative you can stand up and wipe out all of these programs that the moderates in the House strongly support. It would be a field day.

By the same token, we have moderates who do not like a lot of the legislative language that is in here. They can stand up and, one by one by one, they can knock them all out on a point of order. We will end up with practically nothing in this bill, and we will not have taken care of those programs that truly help the needy. I do not think we want to do that. That would be terribly embarrassing to both sides

of the aisle if we let that fiasco take place.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule that has been negotiated for hours with moderates and conservatives by the droves, sometimes 35 or 40 of each, sitting down and working out the rule. It was an agreed-to rule. Everybody was in agreement. Then suddenly, because somebody smells blood, we are going to have a vote on this rule, and some are going to try to defeat the rule. I think that the American people would not like that to happen.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment suggested by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], where we are going to extend the debate time on general debate from 1 hour to 2½ hours. We are then going to set up general debate time on the first three titles, so we can actually have good give and take. We are going to give 90 minutes on each of those titles of general debate before we get into the amendment process. This was suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin. We are going to go along with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 2, line 6, strike "one hour" and insert "two and one-half hours".

Page 3, beginning on line 5, strike "It shall be in order at any time to consider" and insert "Consideration of each of the first three titles of the bill shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the pending title and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It shall be in order at any time during the reading of the bill for amendment to consider".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 104, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—323

Ackerman	Armey	Baker (CA)
Allard	Bachus	Baker (LA)
Archer	Baesler	Baldacci

Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combust
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa

Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchee
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Mica

Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz

Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson

Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—104

Abercrombie
Andrews
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bilbray
Boehlert
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Crane
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dotsett
Durbin
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fields (LA)
Filner
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gibbons

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman
Jacobs
Moakley

Reynolds
Thurman
Tucker

Young (AK)

□ 1235

Messrs. STARK, OLVER, GORDON, SERRANO, GILMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. WISE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on International Relations; Committee on National Security; Committee on Small Business; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. It is my understanding we have been consulted and that there is no objection from our side, with the exception of the Committee on Resources, and I believe the gentleman from New York has taken them off the list, since there was objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, their name is removed from the list.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman for doing that and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 208 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2127.

□ 1237

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is obviously a very difficult and contentious bill. It cuts \$6.3 billion from discretionary budget authority of \$67.2 billion, reducing it to \$60.9 billion.

It is a 9-percent overall cut. It is a cut that is necessary to help bring down deficits and bring our budget as quickly as possible into balance.

The cuts range from a high of 15 percent for funding for programs in the Department of Education to cuts in discretionary spending in the Department of Health and Human Services, which is 3.5 percent.