Sanford	Smith, Linda	Turner
Saxton	Snowbarger	Upton
Schaefer, Dan	Snyder	Velazquez
Schaffer, Bob	Souder	Visclosky
Schumer	Spence	Walsh
Scott	Spratt	Wamp
Sensenbrenner	Stabenow	Waters
Serrano	Stark	Watkins
Sessions	Stearns	Watt (NC)
Shadegg	Stenholm	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Shays	Sununu	Weller
Sherman	Talent	Wexler
Shimkus	Tanner	Weygand
Shuster	Tauzin	White
Sisisky	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Skaggs	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Skeen	Thomas	Wise
Skelton	Thompson	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Wynn
Smith (NJ)	Thune	Yates
Smith (OR)	Thurman	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Smith, Adam	Traficant	

NOT VOTING—19

Berman	Hunter	Scarborough
Bonilla	Markey	Schiff
Collins	Nadler	Stokes
Cummings	Norwood	Vento
Foglietta	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Gonzalez	Riggs	
Hastings (FL)	Roukema	

□ 1503

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2378, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2378) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct the conferees on H.R. 2378, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 2378, be instructed to insist on the House position providing $514,000 for the fourth year of operation of the Exploited Child Unit of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] opposed to the motion?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the motion to instruct conferees.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I say I am opposed to this motion not because of its content, but I am opposed because in the present form it is missing an addition I think is important to be before this House, the addition of language relating to a pay raise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for that ruling. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1993, a 10-year-old little boy, Stanley Burdynski, Junior, was abducted in suburban Prince Georges County, just a few miles from where we stand. Four and one-half years later he is still missing. We must never forget little Stanley. I am sure that every one of the Members has a Stanley or a Mary in their district, a child who has been abducted by a demented criminal person in their districts and in mine.

What this motion to instruct says is that we need to make sure that the fourth year of the program directed at the operation of the Exploited Child Unit of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is fully funded.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything in our power to ensure the fact that we, to the greatest extent possible, can protect our children from exploitation, from being taken from their families, from their neighborhoods, from their playgrounds, from their schools, by those demented souls of which I spoke, subjecting those children to abuse and, yes, even to death. That is what we will vote on in this motion.

I would hope that the House would stand united and unanimous in its commitment to speaking out and acting out and putting our money where our mouth is in the fight against the abusers of children in America.

In 1996 I worked with other concerned Congress men and women to gain funding to create the Exploited Child Unit at the Center for Missing and Exploited Children in the Treasury-Postal bill. John Walsh of America's Most Wanted spoke out and came to Capitol Hill, and had a press conference on this very issue, and said he needed to have every one of us, as he was doing on television every week, committed to the fight against abusers of our children.

This unit creates a greater awareness and generates leaders for law enforcement to combat child sexual exploitation. There are many efforts underway at the Federal level to combat child sexual exploitation that I want to tell the Members about.

□ 1515

Under the leadership of the FBI, each of the seven major law enforcement agencies are coordinating efforts with the National Center to bring a priority approach to such child exploitation cases.

Through the 1994 crime bill, the Secret Service is working closely with the National Center, using unique forensic technology to track abductors. The Customs Service has established the International Pornography Investigation and Coordination Center. The U.S. Postal Service continues its aggressive efforts to crack down on child pornography. The FBI has also established a child abduction and serial killers unit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that through these efforts we can create a new awareness throughout the land and make America's children safer and more secure. I urge my colleagues to support this very important effort to protect our children against exploitation, sexual abuse, and yes, even murder.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] to instruct conferees. I think he has outlined very well the importance of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It is a very small part of our bill, it is a very small part of the funding, but it is a critical part.

A few months ago, during our hearing process, I went over to Virginia and visited this office. It breaks my heart when I see some of the posters that are on the wall, some of the letters that are there from families who have lost their child, who desperately want help in trying to find that child, and turn in sheer despair, with no other place to go to but to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Sometimes it is hard for us in Congress to take a lot of credit or a lot of pride in the things we do. But if there is anything we can take pride in, it is the fact that we have funded this National Center.

It is one, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] pointed out, that had its beginnings with John

Walsh, whose son, Adam, was brutally kidnapped and murdered in Florida more than a decade ago. John Walsh started a private foundation. Due to the work of some other people, we came along a few years ago and we joined hands and created the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

We provide about $2 million to the Secret Service to assist in the investigations of missing children, mostly for fingerprinting, identification, handwriting analysis. The $514,000 that is the subject of this motion here is earmarked specifically for the exploitation unit which has been established.

We think it is absolutely critical that we deal not only with the children who are missing, but those who are being exploited by, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said, the demented souls who would use them, use children for pornography, who would abuse them mentally, who would abuse them physically.

That is what this Center for Exploitation deals with. We have never had a specific unit in the National Center dedicated to this before. We would earmark these funds in order to be sure that this is adequately funded and that we really can focus on this issue. That is really the subject of what we are debating here today.

I certainly hope that we will go to conference with a strong message urging our conferees to stand by our language on this so that we can go to the Senate and say ''This is something we strongly believe in.''

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that the first thing that we say is ''We like this amendment.'' It makes sense. It made sense when we passed it. The protection of exploited children is a national issue important to all Americans' hearts.

But confidence in this Congress to handle fairly all issues vital to citizens is clouded by previous procedures used to allow a salary increase for Members of Congress to go through just last week without a vote. We are just going to ask to oppose the motion in its present form, not the content. We just want to add something. We would like to add that we would like to take the Senate language, they already voted against a salary increase, so we would say that to slow down a couple of minutes on this floor, to add this salary increase motion to this other vital motion is not much to ask to restore the confidence in America in Congress, in what we are doing.

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

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

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH.]

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH], for yielding me the time.

I would like to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], for again bringing our attention to this vital issue.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is important to reiterate that we agree on making sure that resources are there to make sure that we reach out to find those children who are missing, who are abducted.

But there is another question dealing with resource allocation, dealing with the finances of this country, which we must deal with in this very House, and it has to do with pay for Members who serve here in the Congress of the United States.

It is a vexing question and a unique question for those of us who sit in this Chamber who are charged, if you will, with the country's bank account, who have seen time and again overdrafts on that account, overdrafts that would not be countenanced for a single nanosecond outside the halls of Government. But because Government can make the rules, Government can engage in creative accounting.

Sadly, that has been the case all too often. Members here work hard. That is not the issue. But public service is a privilege rather than a career. Many Members of this institution have made financial sacrifices. That is something that at times is the price of freedom.

Another real world standard that seems to have left this debate is the notion of performance. In education, in business, in athletics, indeed in every endeavor in life, work or play, there is a performance criteria that must be accepted.

Speaking for myself and the people I represent in the Sixth District of Arizona, my constituents have made it crystal clear to me, and indeed I believe people from coast to coast and in Alaska and Hawaii as well, wanted those of us who serve in this Congress to work for fiscal accountability, to balance the budget, just as families around the kitchen table are forced to do. And at the very least, my colleagues, at the very least, Mr. Speaker, any increase in pay should be tied to performance.

I do not believe, in good conscience, that we who serve representing the citizens of the United States from a variety of walks of life, that we in good conscience can accept a cost of living adjustment or a pay hike, or whatever we want to call it, so long as we fail to balance the budget. That is the sole requirement I believe necessary for the American people to reward us, in their judgment, with a pay increase.

And indeed, Mr. Speaker, as we look from coast to coast and beyond to those who wear the uniforms of this Nation, who would put themselves in harm's way, we have read the accounts, we have heard the situation where some of those who defend America are forced to apply for food stamps to feed their families. How in good conscience can we rise even for a minimal cost of living adjustment when those needs still exist for those who would put their lives on the line?

Mr. Speaker, those who gathered at the structure we now call Independence Hall in Philadelphia, in drafting that remarkable document that declared our independence from England in the Declaration of Independence, in those final key lines, our Founders said, ''and to this we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.''

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we can do no less. Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a little history. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], my colleague and friend, spoke about performance and that we at this time should not receive any kind of a cost-of-living adjustment. I think it is worth the time for Members to understand where we have been legislatively with this.

It goes back before some of the Members who will speak on this were here. Because of the very great difficulty that we had with the issue of the pay raise, in 1989 this Congress passed a provision to permanent law, I want to underscore that, ''permanent law,'' which took it out of the hands of Congress so that we would not engage in the kind of demagogic debate that sometimes goes on in this body over this particular issue. And we said that there would be a committee that would survey private sector wage rates for the previous year and the Federal employees would get an increase, a cost-of-living adjustment equal to that and that those at the very top of the scale, Cabinet officers, SES judges, executive service judges, and Members of Congress would get a cost-of-living adjustment that was half a percent below that, so that Members of Congress get a cost-of-living adjustment half a percent below what all other Federal employees would get.

Subsequent to that, of course, this Congress has entered into a number of debates on the subject. Despite the fact that we took it out of our own hands, we have entered into this debate and we have denied ourselves even the cost-of-living adjustment that was going to all other Federal employees.

It was specifically in order to avoid this debate of having Congress vote on whether it was raising its own salaries or giving itself a cost-of-living adjustment that we created that provision, that we adopted that procedure. I think it is important for Members of this body to know that that is the procedure that this body adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how wonderful it is to hear the same old speeches about how rotten a job the Members of Congress have done for the American people.

In the last 20 years, I have seen a moderate economy expand exponentially and then collapse. We have gone through various recessions. I have seen moderate inflation go to rampant inflation, 14, 15 percent rates of inflation, interest rates go to 21 percent. I have seen the Soviet empire, collapse. I have seen policies implemented to bring interest rates down, bringing inflation down, bringing unemployment down.

American people today are probably as well off as they have been in a generation. Interest rates are at a generational low. Inflation rates are at a generational low. The United States is not at war, hot or cold. I think we are doing pretty well. For the first time in 30 years, we have reached a balanced budget agreement, only a month ago. For the first time in 16 years, we have passed legislation for a tax cut for the American people.

For the speaker that was here two times ago to come before the House floor and say that the American people have been ill-served by the U.S. Congress is a disservice to the performance of this body and the other body.

□ 1530

The U.S. Congress is performing well, in bipartisan fashion, with conservatives and liberals and Republicans and Democrats alike working together. And to condemn the work product and say that we are lesser than all employees of the United States who all want a pay raise, to say that we are lesser than all Federal employees who have not missed a beat, or lesser than anybody else who gets an automatic cost-of-living adjustment does a disservice to the work product of this body.

I do not like to see the work product of the U.S. Congress denigrated when I believe that the last 20 years that I have witnessed have been some of the most productive years of American legislative history. The Congress found of its own self that practices of the past were questionable and should be abolished. The honoraria was given up in 1989 under the agreement that the Congress would be subject to the cost-of-living adjustment for every single year, but at a half point less than Federal employees. That agreement held for 2 years. In 1992, the Congress gave itself the last cost-of-living adjustment.

I daresay inflation has not kept constant, but the Congress has not had a cost-of-living increase, the Congress has not had any pay increase, and for Members to get on the floor and demagog and say they do not deserve any pay increase is for them to say that the American people do not deserve to keep up with the cost of living or that Federal employees do not deserve a cost-of-living adjustment.

It is not politically wise for me to stand here and make this speech. I will be roundly chastised in my district and around the country. But I believe strongly that for Members to demagog and say we are not worth what every other American citizen is worth, for Members to say that if you are a millionaire, you are better off, or you do not have to worry about pay raises, you only have to face up to the votes, the tough votes, is for Members simply to say the U.S. Congress is not worth the people's attention and their investment, and I do not believe that.

I believe that we are a productive, good body, and I believe that this cost-of-living adjustment is worth it. I believe that anybody that does not want the cost-of-living adjustment can do one thing: Say he does not want it and donate it to charity. That is all you have got to do.

I just put my last kid through college. All I have got to do is pay the bills. I am not independently wealthy. For those of our Members that do not have to worry about college bills or paying any bills, I am proud of you, because that is America. America is doing better. But I believe in public service, and I believe in equal pay for equal work, and I believe that if you do not believe it, you are wrong.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, if there is any belief that our constituents cling to with stubborn resolve, it is that each of us have come here to either enrich ourselves financially or advance ourselves politically. Frankly, in the last few days we have done very little to acquit ourselves of any of these charges. We have a continuing refusal to bring campaign finance reform to the floor of the House despite the fact that the public is clamoring for such a debate and such change. We will soon debate a bill on the floor that carves out a whole new category of citizenship just for Members of Congress. And then we have the pay raise, a pay raise that was disguised in a bill by parliamentary sleight of hand. And last night when an attempt was made to make in order a revisitation of that pay raise, it was ruled out of order by the Committee on Rules and described in today's paper as frivolous. Whatever good will this body has built up over the past few months given our bipartisan budget decision and other proposals that the public supports, it is being eroded quickly.

Benjamin Disraeli, when he came into the government in Britain, said, ''I was told that the privileged and the people form two nations.'' That is interesting, because when I got involved in government in the United States, I was told just the opposite. But it appears that our actions of the last few days suggest there are, in fact, the privileged and the people. That needs to change. This is the people's House. Let us return to the people's business, and let us restore some of the people's trust in this institution. Defeat the previous question. Have the debate. Discuss the pay raise. Vote for it if you believe in it. Vote against it if you do not. But do not let the highest legislative body in this democracy shun public scrutiny.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to some of those who favor this motion by the gentlewoman which seeks to void the cost-of-living adjustment for Congress. I think that they are very far removed from the realities here. Our constituents, in my opinion, oppose efforts by Congress to carve out special treatment for themselves, for example, subsidizing activities here or perhaps special services that other Americans do not receive. But I think that they understand the concept of a COLA. It is an inflation factor. It is a cost-of-living adjustment. It is the same type of COLA or inflation factor that other Federal employees get, that members of the judiciary get, that Social Security recipients get, and many others get. In fact, it is a little less, a half percent even less than those.

I think that we are really not relaying, if you will, to the American people what is really going on here if we continue to talk about it as somehow something privileged or something very special. It is not. That is the difference. I know that when I talk to my constituents, if I told them that we were going to vote ourselves a 15,000 or 20,000 or $25,000 pay raise, they would say, that's outrageous. You don't deserve it. But when we tell them that we are just giving ourselves a COLA and we proceed in the fashion just like other Federal employees, just like Social Security, just like so many other Americans, I think they understand that. I think they understand that all of us have to make a living and that over the years, inflation and costs go up, and that we are justified in doing so.

I know that there has been some argument here about the way that we have gone about it. There is no question in my mind that the gentlewoman is perfectly justified in bringing up this motion today and having us vote on it and articulating what she is all about. But the basic philosophy behind the COLA makes sense. I think that if we settled with it, if we said, ''OK, we're going to have the COLA, and it's going to go on every year,'' we would get away from this whole idea of having to come to the floor and in some cases disguise what we are actually doing. It should be no different than other Federal employees. I understand why she is bringing up the motion, but I would urge that we defeat her motion.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the bill that would have a pay increase. In our own conference when the veterans' COLA came up, I fought against my own Republican Party because they wanted to cut a veterans' COLA. Why? Veterans sign on a dotted line that if they serve the amount of time in the service of this country, and at the end of that time that is the contract they operated under, they would have a retirement; and that that retirement, should it lose money each year because of inflation, that was not the intent. I chastised my own party for that. We turned that around.

If you had a pay increase that gave you more money than just maintaining parity, it is a parity issue, does the dollar maintain the same value that you came with, then I think Members have got the right to chastise what we are doing here. But in an amendment that maintains parity, that is a half a percent below actual parity, then I do not think the Members have a complaint as far as a COLA, because most of us support a COLA for Social Security. We support it for our veterans. We support it for Federal employees, because it maintains the dollar value that those individuals have in their paycheck. It is not meant to get less and less and less with inflation, depending on what it is. That is the same reason most of us support indexing of capital gains, because it indexes the value of that dollar right along with inflation.

I think it is disingenuous, maybe with good intention, but disingenuous, to suggest that this was a pay increase. It is not. Because I will vote against a pay increase, a COLA that is more than just meeting parity. I think that is wrong. I think it is wrong, and most of us this day will not vote for a pay increase. I ask my colleagues to vote against the motion.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people in America have lost faith in the institution of Congress. It did not happen overnight. It has been building for many years. All they want us to do in honest, open debate is to listen to issues and do the right things for the right reasons.

Last week was not one of our brighter moments, because we did not do any of that. Rather than having an honest, open debate on a pay raise—and we respectfully disagree; I oppose it and some Members support it—rather than standing on the principle of honest, open government, we hid behind a procedure. That was a loss for Congress, and it was a loss for America. Last week we spent more time commemorating the life of Jimmy Stewart than we did debating a $28 billion bill and a pay raise for Congress. That is wrong. The issue is not the pay raise. It is how we are going about it and what we stand for.

We have Members that I have been very impressed with in my short 9 months here, and I do not deny their strong feelings for a pay raise. We are not going to get a straightforward, open vote on this. This is as close as we are going to get, but we are going to make every effort to at least tell the American public on this vote how we feel as a Congress about a pay raise.

And a final thought. I served in the Texas Legislature before coming to Congress. At one time we had a proposal to give the biggest tax increase in Texas history as a growing State, and we were told that it took courage and guts to vote for a tax increase, that the easy thing was to hold the line on the budget and to live within our means, but if we had courage and guts, we would vote for a tax increase. That was a silly argument then, and it is a silly argument to believe that it is difficult and courageous to vote yourself a pay raise. Ask any family in America, and that is an easy decision.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and in opposition to the motion of the gentlewoman to forgo the cost-of-living adjustment. I may be in a minority here among people who in 1992 took about a $25,000 cut when I was elected to the Congress of the United States. I had a successful law practice. I believe if I had been in the law practice for the 5 years that I have been here, I would probably have made by now $100,000 or $150,000 or $200,000 more than I have made as a Member of Congress. That to me is unimportant, because I signed on for this job with an expectation that we would maintain a level of parity in our salaries.

□ 1545

What is a lot more important than that to me is the judges who each year have contacted me and said, ''Please, give us our cost-of-living adjustment so that we don't continue to lose good qualified people from our judiciary.''

It is absolutely important in a democracy such as ours that we have qualified members of the judiciary, qualified members of the legislative branch, and qualified members of the executive branch.

I believe we have done a good job during the period that I have been in this body, and I encourage my colleagues to give up on this notion that we should browbeat ourselves and not maintain parity in our salaries.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me just cover once again what this bill is and what it is not, what this motion is and what it is not.

The Treasury, Postal Service and general government appropriations bill that is before us does not have any provision dealing with Members' pay; it does not have any provision dealing with Federal employees' compensation or cost-of-living adjustments or Member's cost-of-living adjustments. There is, let me repeat, no provision in this bill dealing with compensation for Members or Federal employees. There is no provision dealing with this at all in our bill.

I think it is important that we keep that in mind because a lot of people have been saying that a vote on this bill has to do with a cost-of-living increase, a pay increase, increase in compensation for Members. It does not. And that is because this body and the other body, the Congress of the United States, decided in 1989 to take this issue out of our own hands and to make it that Members of Congress would get a cost-of-living adjustment and nothing else based on the increase in the ECI index, and that index with complicated formula which is different for Federal employees than Members of Congress because of the locality pay, but it is established that Members of Congress can never get beyond what a Federal employee gets in an increase in the cost-of-living adjustment.

That is the permanent law. That is the permanent law, and if Members of Congress do not like that, where are the bills to repeal that section? Why do we not have bills introduced? Why do we not get that debate on that issue? It is not an appropriation issue. There is no account in Treasury, this appropriation bill, for Members' salaries because Members are constitutional officers. There is no reason for us to vote on this bill and assume that we are in any way voting for an increase in Members' compensation.

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Senate does have a provision to strike the pay raise, and that is all the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] wanted to say, that they have struck the pay raise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with somewhat mixed feelings on this whole issue, and I would like to start by joining the gentleman from Maryland in supporting what he is trying to do, and the protection of children is certainly very important to all of us, but I do think we need to add a provision that allows us a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote on the pay raise issue. And let me make it clear that I would oppose a pay raise at this point in time myself. Personally I am opposed to any elected body giving itself a pay raise, but that is not really why I am rising to speak on this particular issue.

What I am really opposed to is the way the bill was passed last week, brought up unexpectedly with virtually no notice and not giving the Members of this body the opportunity to have a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote on this very, very important issue. This type of action is what makes our constituents back home so angry, the idea that we are going to try and slide something through with people unaware. That is what makes the American people angry, and that is why I am rising to speak today.

I would like to speak specifically to some of my colleagues who believe the cost-of-living adjustment is acceptable. I understand where they are coming from, and I honestly believe there are many, many people in America that would concur that a cost-of-living adjustment is appropriate, and I would like to also align myself with comments of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. He is absolutely right. Good things have been done by this Congress. We are having the first balanced budget since 1969, the first tax cut in 16 years, and the responsibility for much of that credit should go to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for bringing us to this point.

But to my colleagues that think the cost-of-living adjustment is acceptable and what their constituents would want them to vote for I simply say, ''Stand up, cast your vote, let your constituents know where you stand and why you stand there.'' There will be a lot of people in America who say it is acceptable in the view of our first balanced budget and taxes coming down and Medicare restored, that a cost-of-living adjustment is acceptable. All we are asking for is an up-or-down vote. Just give us a vote so that the American people do not think we are breaking their trust because, my colleagues, that is what this is all about.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. This is a question of accountability. I myself am for the COLA. But the point is we have to be accountable to the public on either side of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Representative NEUMANN and to urge that we defeat the previous question and to oppose the procedure that allows Members to collect an automatic COLA and shields them from public accountability without an upfront vote.

When I took my seat in Congress in 1981, among the first pieces of legislation I introduced was a bill injecting a new degree of sunlight into the Members' compensation process. My legislation was straightforward:

Every increase in Member's salary or benefits or a favorable change in their tax treatment must withstand a recorded vote in this Chamber and the other body. Once approved, that pay raise or tax change could not take effect until after the next congressional election.

Our logic was simple. If Members' felt they deserved a pay raise, they should be willing to stand up and vote for it publicly. Furthermore, to allow their constituents to determine if their Member was deserving of that pay raise, that Member would have to stand for election before collecting the larger paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, the keystone here is accountability—something that has been completely lacking around here lately.

Like many of my colleagues, I was appalled at the ''fast track'' consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill last week. Despite all the protestations to the contrary, it is clear that the Treasury-Postal bill was rammed through this House in record time in an effort to avoid a vote on a pay raise amendment.

Is it any wonder that the American people are growing more cynical about Congress and the political process every day?

First come the headlines that we have slipped in to the tax bill a secret $50 billion tax break for big tobacco.

Now, we refuse to find a way to vote on an amendment that would prevent Members from collecting an automatic pay increase.

And here we are today. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that our colleague, LINDA SMITH, can offer a new motion to instruct the conferees to kill the pay increase. And I do not argue that we cannot justify a COLA—I think we can but not by hiding it and avoiding an upfront vote.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by saying for goodness sakes, colleagues, just when we are starting to restore the trust of the American people in this institution by fulfilling our promises to reach a balanced budget, by bringing their taxes down for the first time in a generation, restoring Medicare for our senior citizens, we are just starting to restore the trust of the American people, let us not go and do something like this that they perceive to be a move behind closed doors and behind their back trying too slide something through. For goodness sakes, we are starting to restore that trust, let us have an up-or-down vote on this. If my colleagues believe a COLA is acceptable, vote ''yes,'' and if my colleagues think their constituents do not want a COLA, well then for goodness sakes vote ''no,'' but let us have the vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose any motion to delete the COLA for us as citizens and as workers in this government.

First of all, I resent the self-flagellation that I am hearing against Members of Congress and this institution which we so ably represent. I think I among others work as hard as anyone in this government, harder than some, so I am not ashamed to come to this podium today to say we deserve a cost-of-living increase. I give no excuses for having to ask this Congress to do this. If we are not ashamed of the work we do, then we should not be ashamed to stand up and say, yes, we believe, we do believe, in the cost-of-living.

Soap costs me as much as it does anyone else. I pay the same money for soap as the woman out there on Pennsylvania Avenue pays. I work just as hard as she does, and I say to this Congress we deserve to do this, and I just want to say to my colleagues, ''You need some pride in the institution which you represent. If you're not proud of it, then think of David McCullough's words as he spoke to us in the bipartisan retreat and we were finding, what he said, some type of pride in what we do, and the willingness to go forward to speak up for this wonderful institution which was brought to us by our Founding Fathers.''

And I quote Mr. McCullough and I do not have a lot of time, but he said it has been the will of heaven that we, the Members of Congress, should be thrown into existence in a period when the greatest philosophers and law givers of antiquity have wished to have lived. Right away we see he is saying it is the will of heaven, there are larger forces than we ourselves, and he is applying the moment against the standard of the past, and that is antiquity.

It is a very large degree, a lesson in propulsion, a period when a coincidence of circumstances without an example has afforded to 13 colonies at once, and he goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. What he is trying to say to us, that there should be pride in those of us who represent this institution.

I give no excuses for being a Member of Congress. I am proud of it, and I say that every Member of this Congress works hard enough for a cost-of-living increase. We deserve it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the most intellectually vapid and vacuous arguments I have heard in opposition to the COLA. The fact is there is no logical argument to be made against the COLA other than those people who enjoy self-flagellation, who enjoy pandering and do not have the guts to stand up for what they believe in. If they do not have the pride to accept a COLA which was set in law then, quite frankly, I do not think they deserve to be in the House of Representatives.

What are they ashamed of? We are talking about an American economy which is stronger than any economy in the history of the world. We are talking about an American Government which right now is not at war. There is not one American soldier losing his life or her life anywhere in the world today, and yet we have people coming before the House and saying the American people are outraged at the Congress. The only reason the American people have a reason to be outraged at

the Congress is they listen to some of the ridiculous arguments that were made here today by people who want to pander, who want to appeal to the least common denominator and who want to tear down this institution.

I am proud to be a Member of Congress; I will be very proud to accept the COLA because I believe I earn my money. I also believe that the position of a Member of Congress deserves the increase, whether or not that person happens to be qualified or not qualified, and quite frankly listening to some people today, I can see why they do not want to take a pay raise, because they have a good self-analysis, and maybe they believe, as individuals, they do not deserve the pay raise.

But in spite of that I believe that the institution as itself, as an institution, deserves to have a COLA, deserves to keep in line with the American people and with the cost of living, because if my colleagues follow their logic, when would there have been a COLA; during the Depression? During World War II? During the Korean war? During Watergate? During the cold war? There would never have been a raise, and we would end up having what we are coming close to having today, a Congress of wackos and millionaires reaching a situation where working people, and I am talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

But in any event, very seriously, if we are to be proud of ourselves as an institution, if we are going to have enough self pride to stand up for what we believe in, let us have the guts to accept the COLA and not be pandering, not be yielding to the lowest common denominator.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strongest opposition to the motion of the gentlewoman from Washington, and I ask my colleagues to show some guts, show some courage, stand up for what they believe in.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise here acknowledging the fact that people work very hard in Congress, but what I think we have to remind ourselves is the fact that we are not veterans, some of us are, we are not farmers, we are not teachers, all of whom deserve a COLA, but what we are is the elected representative Government of the United States of America, and as such I think we have to in essence be held to a higher standard because what the American public expects of us is that we lead by example.

When Washington crossed the Delaware 200 years ago he did not say to the folks, ''You guys get in the boat, and I'll meet you on the other side.'' He got in the boat with them. And if my colleagues look at our budget, 73 percent of the cuts, the savings, whatever they want to call them, still come in the last 2 years of the budget, so there is much savings still expected from our American public, and as such I think we need to lead by example.

The second reason I rise in support of this amendment is for the simple reason of sunshine. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] already suggested this but just in terms of process I think it is very important, whether we think it is a good thing or think it is a bad thing, that we take an up-or-down vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who probably has taken more heat and shown more courage and more intellectual honesty on this issue than anybody in the House.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for those glowing remarks; I hope I live up to them. He certainly deserves a lot of credit for all the leadership he has provided on this issue.

Let me say that I want to speak more than anything else to the Members who have come here in the last 3 elections because I think they have overlooked a lot of history that this Congress struggled with throughout most of the 1980's and into this decade.

In 1989 a bipartisan task force was created and reported to this Congress a package of ethics reforms that I think are historic. Certainly that is what President Bush said when he signed them into law. They prohibited Members from accepting honoraria for speeches, a practice that was very prevalent here, and played into charges of special interest dominance; we severely restricted the ability of Members to receive outside income, in other words we could no longer put our name on the door of a law firm and draw down an income; we provided stricter financial reporting requirements which cover not only Members but all high-paid employees of this branch of government and others in the other two branches; we repealed the loophole that said we could take our campaign funds with us when we left Congress as income and live off them, and regrettably some had taken large sums with them; we restricted the ability to lobby in post-employment periods; and we also made a number of other changes that were fundamental and much acclaimed.

□ 1600

We took action to increase compensation, and, by the way, the gentlewoman from Washington was wrong in a press release she issued. It was not a midnight pay raise. It was debated and voted in the light of day, a majority of both parties supported it, and we were proud not only of our courage in dealing with the pay issue, but in our ability to reform ourselves in a way that was long overdue.

We dealt also with the conflict of interest that we all have. We are blamed if we vote ourselves a pay raise, and we are blamed if we create a mechanism which absolves us of that responsibility if it is a COLA and not a pay raise.

We took the employment cost index, which is the measure of private sector pay, and said in the year following, we would take whatever our constituents earned, reduce it by half a percent, and take that as a cost-of-living adjustment, not as a pay raise. In fact, a court in the District of Columbia, an appellate court, ruled that this COLA is not a pay raise. If it were a pay raise, like the increase we took in 1989 and 1990, we would have to vote on it by law. This reform required it. But we believe and polls confirm that a cost-of-living adjustment is acceptable to the American people. Otherwise, if we fail to take COLA's we will be back in the position of having to vote ourselves, periodically, a large pay raise—one we cannot defend to the public.

We wanted to avoid doing that, and yet at the same time compensate our judges, our executive officers, our top staff, yes, ourselves, by providing not what others were getting on average something less but making an attempt to keep pace with the cost of living. No more, no less.

It was, and I believe still is, the recommendation of a bipartisan, unanimous task force. Congress approved this as a way of avoiding the conflict of voting ourselves a pay raise.

Now, I realize that accountability is important. Credibility is also, just as it was then. I would urge every Member to either take the raise and be public about it as a cost-of-living adjustment, or not take it and be public about that, if that is what serves your personal needs or political interests. But do not come to the floor and prevent this mechanism which we agreed to in a bipartisan way from being implemented.

This is the key vote on whether or not Members have enough self-respect to adequately represent their constituents. I ask for an aye vote on the previous question and final passage.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a point that actually the majority voted against the pay increase last week, 102 to 112, so they would not have passed it had they been the only people here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am still trying to decide if I am a wacko or a millionaire. It is probably a wacko.

But as a businessman, for the last 32 years, the one thing that I do realize is if my company was $5 trillion in debt and still losing money, the last thing I would do is give management a pay raise. If we do that, we are sending the wrong message to this country.

That is why yesterday I introduced a bill that will for once and for all do away with COLA's. We do not need COLA's in this body. The people of this country want us to stand up like men and women, representing our own constituencies; they want us to stand up and vote on whether or not we should give that.

Is that too much to ask for the people of this country? My bill basically

does away with COLA's, and if we want a pay raise, let us come to the floor, let us ask for the pay raise, let us vote on it, vote it up or down, and then we can go home and be accountable to our people.

But without that, Mr. Speaker, I think we will continue to go through this every year, as we have for the last 3 or 4 years, and every year the same debate comes up. So let us once and for all do away with the COLA's. If we want a pay raise, let us be up front about it, let us bring it before this body, and let everyone vote on it, and vote it up or down.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON].

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the children, not the 27 pictures that I hold in my hand right now, whose pictures were printed in the Houston Chronicle on Sunday, all of whom were abducted and most of whom have been found, unfortunately, dead.

We have got to speak to the lives of the 114,500 children that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children are trying to be the strong voice for and having them returned to their families. I think it is wrong for us to be playing politics with an issue as major as that of protecting our children. I find it very interesting that this is a day that we have so much interest on such a totally different issue.

We need to put our kids first, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to identify myself with the remarks of the previous speaker. I agree. And today's debate would not be needed if last week's event would not have occurred during the Treasury-Postal debate.

It was last week that we were supposed to be debating this type of motion and this issue. I walked onto the floor ready to talk about the issue, and whether you believe in the COLA or whether you disagree with the COLA, what we were talking about was a vote on the issue.

I was here, ready to talk about it. I stepped into the cloakroom and made a phone call, and by the time I came out, it had been slipped through and we voted on it, and it passed.

What we are talking about here is open, honest government. It is not about whether we deserve or do not deserve a COLA. What we are talking about is integrity in the institution. Like the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about earlier, whether you believe in it or do not believe in it, it is not right to be deceitful and deceiving the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong approval of this motion. Vote against the rule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to inform Members that the bill was on the floor for over three-quarters of an hour.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, there are two issues before us: One, do you favor or oppose an automatic pay raise; and the second is do you believe or do you not believe in accountability?

This first vote is are you willing to stand up for what you believe in? I have heard a lot of people talk about courage and principle here, and then tell everybody here that they want to cast a vote that is going to use procedure to avoid being counted for where they stand. Now, I do not think that is accountability and I do not think that is responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind all Members in this Chamber, only by voting no on the previous question will we get the opportunity to give these people who profess courage the opportunity to actually cast a vote that they are claiming courage for.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Smith amendment. I ask my colleagues to consider the senior citizens living on fixed incomes, the American working families trying to make ends meet while holding down two to three jobs, working 7 days a week, and consider our young people, hoping to achieve the American dream, while paying off thousands of dollars in school loans and car payments. I ask Members to vote against the cost-of-living adjustment.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished majority whip, let me respond to a comment made a moment earlier about this bill being slipped through. It was done in the middle of the afternoon. It had been on the whip notice for 2 weeks that it was coming up when we finished the interminable debate over Labor-HHS.

If in 48 minutes Members cannot find their way to the floor and offer an amendment, I do not know why. Maybe it says something. Maybe the cost of living adjustment is not justified under those circumstances. There was no attempt to be deceitful. There was no attempt to do anything that was not above board.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished Majority Whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4½ minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say if this were a pay raise, as so many have portrayed it, I would oppose it, what we are talking about here today. This is not a pay raise; this is about an inflation adjustment. It is about upholding a law that was passed in 1989.

I know Members have deep feelings on this issue. I just disagree with them. What is really sad to me in the press reports, because many journalists have gotten it wrong and they got it wrong mainly because they were told wrong. I was on the floor the entire time this bill was debated last week, and there were Members who were against the COLA that were on the floor and did not offer an amendment, even though it was germane, and chose not to use the procedure by which they could as Members of the House effect what they want.

This bill does not even speak to inflation adjustment. No appropriation bills do. In fact, to the gentleman from Montana, if you want to use procedure, you have to use procedure in order to have an amendment to change the law of 1989.

So I just say that if Members want sunshine and they want a vote on the law of 1989, then learn the legislative process. Introduce a bill and repeal or amend the 1989 law that set up the pay process that we go through.

The 1989 law that we passed, as many have said, is a law that tried to deal with this terrible issue of making sure that Members of Congress have a standard of living by which they can raise their families and live decently while they serve. No outside income is allowed. We eliminated outside income, except in certain cases.

Now, millionaires that serve here and people with previous businesses are able to supplement their income when they find out that they cannot live on this salary. Well, I challenge them to live on this salary and then come down here and oppose a cost of living adjustment.

We eliminated honoraria, which was a terrible practice, and instituted a pay raise that brought us into parity with the kind of purchasing power that Members had back in the 1970's. We did not have this huge pay raise. We just came back to that purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the purchasing power of the pay for Members of Congress was in 1969 if you use 1997 dollars? It is $186,676 in today's money. Yet we raised pay to $133,600. Now, where is the pay raise in that? So if you are going to be on this floor and talk about pay raises, at least get it in perspective about what we are talking about.

We passed a constitutional amendment, the Madison amendment, that was ratified in 1992, that said no pay raise would go into effect until there is an intervening election. I think that is the kind of reform that we should have done.

Now, where we shot ourselves in the foot is constantly allowing procedure to be used in order to bring an amendment to the floor nongermane to the bills, so we could all stand up and beat

our chest and say ''I am going to refuse the cost of living adjustment.''

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something: Members of this House have families.

□ 1615

They have two homes, in most cases. Some Members are living in their offices, because they cannot afford a second residence. The Members of this House are at the age when they have their children in college, and I have to tell my colleagues, and I am not making excuses or apologizing, it is difficult to raise a family and serve in Congress under these conditions, not to speak of the times that we spend away from our wives and children and the sacrifices they make to allow us to be here.

Well, I tell my colleagues, my wife, and my children sacrifice enough. They deserve a decent living, and I am going to give it to them, because I am going to vote for the previous question and vote for the motion to instruct.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me point out that legislation has been introduced to end this automatic pay increase for Congress. In fact, one of my good friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], is a cosponsor of that, but for some reason, it has not been on the floor of this House for a vote. So to say that there are other ways to do this, I think, is somewhat disingenuous.

For the record, Members of Congress earn $133,000 each year. The COLA that we are talking about is a $3,000 pay increase that would go into effect next year, and my problem with this process is that there is too much unfinished business in this House for us to vote a pay increase for ourselves.

Many said it is merely a COLA, just like Social Security has a COLA. Well, Social Security still is not secure, because we are stealing from that trust fund to pay for the cost of Government.

They say it is just like the COLA in capital gains, but we failed to pass a COLA for capital gains. It was not indexed in our tax cut. They say it is just like the COLA for veterans, but we still have not made up the lost ground to our veterans from the Clinton cut in their COLA. So there is too much unfinished business in this Congress for us to be passing a pay raise.

Let me tell my colleagues exactly what will happen in a few minutes. We will be asked to vote on the previous question. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' What that does is say we will not have a gag process; we will let a vote come forward on whether or not this Congress should have a pay increase, and then one can vote up or down as to whether we should agree to the Senate position, and the Senate position is that there should be no pay increase until we have finished our business.

I urge my friends and colleagues to think of this as a matter of unfinished business for this Congress, to do what is right, act correctly, and let us have a vote on this pay increase issue. Vote ''no'' on the previous question when it comes up in a few minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is a vote about what we think of ourselves, what we think of this institution, and the trust and confidence we have in those who send us here; a vote on whether we believe that they believe we are worth what they pay us.

This issue is about staying even; not about raises, about staying even. Ask any of our Social Security recipients or our veterans when they get a cost-of-living adjustment if they got a raise, and they will say, my friend, you do not understand. My grocery costs went up, my prescription drugs went up, my oil heat bill went up. Yes, perhaps even my college tuition for my child went up. This is about staying even.

Let me reiterate what the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] said. In 1989, the Members of this House, in a courageous and honest vote, said to their constituents, we are not going to take outside income. We will rely only on our salary, not on the payment of special interest gussied up to be honoraria for speeches. In 16 out of 28 years, or 18 out of 26 years, we said we were going to take no cost-of-living adjustment, and as a result, the pent-up needs of our families led us to invoke, from time to time, raises of very substantial proportions, as much as 27 percent.

Our constituents and our public were outraged, because they did not know that we had not gotten a raise the 6 previous years. They did not know that we were catching up. They thought that we were taking some outrageous pay. Can you blame them? Of course not.

So what the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the Republican leadership proposed was a mechanism whereby we would not do that to ourselves, to this institution, or, very frankly, to add to the cynicism of our public, and that all we would take is a cost-of-living adjustment, which, as I reiterate, keeps us even with the increased costs that we are confronted with on an annual basis. That increased cost would be less by half a point than the private sector increase.

Now, my friends, let me say, so we do not feel badly about what I hope we are going to do, that since 1970, the CPI has increased by 292 percent. Military pay has increased by 320 percent. All private sector pay has increased by 264 percent. Manufacturing blue collar workers, I tell my friends, has increased by 281 percent. Federal retiree pensions increased by 291 percent, just about the CPI Federal civilian pay by 243 percent, and Members of Congress by 207 percent; I tell my friends, again, some 70 percent below manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona talked about our Founding Fathers who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Most of us in this body do not have fortunes to pledge, but if, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said, we do not on a regular basis stay even, not a raise, stay even with the increased costs confronted by our families, then, of necessity, we will become a body of those who only have fortunes.

Our honor. I ask every one of my colleagues who has come up to me over the last 10 years and said, I hope you effect a pay raise, to vote for this, for if that is true, there will be about 375 of my colleagues who will vote ''yes'' on the previous question. Vote for exploited children's protection, vote ''yes'' on the previous question, vote ''yes'' on the amendment to instruct the Senate to protect exploited children.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the motion being considered today and urge may colleagues to oppose it and vote no. Simply put, this congress has not had the opportunity to vote on stopping the automatic cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress. I believe that it is wrong to increase congressional pay at a time when we must make further cuts in Government spending to balance the budget. At the very least, the American people are entitled to a vote so that they know their Member of Congress' position on increasing their own salaries. I want to make it very clear that I would vote no if there was such a vote. Should we fail in our effort to stop the pay raise I will donate the entire amount to charity. I will only accept the salary I was elected to receive.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as we proceed in this debate, and as chairman of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I would like to remind my colleagues of the importance of the National Center for missing and Exploited Children. The National Center has helped locate 114,600 missing children. We should not play politics with its funding. Missing children and frightened families should be held sacred by this body.

Just last Sunday, the Houston Chronicle printed the pictures of 27 girls who have been abducted in the area in and around the Ninth Congressional District. Our most recent tragedies include 12-year-old Laura Smither of Friendswood. Laura was abducted while on her morning jog. Her body was found 2 weeks later. She had been murdered. And now we are searching for 17-year-old Jessica Cain of Tiki island. Jessica never came home after a party on August 19. Her truck was found with the engine running and her wallet still on the front seat. I have met the Smither and Cain families. I have searched through woods looking for their daughters. Most importantly, in becoming involved with this issue, I have come to know and respect the excellent work done by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children on behalf of these children and their families.

We need to give our full support to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and give the issue our full attention and respect. I ask my colleagues to protect the funding for the National Center for Missing

and Exploited Children and to untie any provision affecting the National Center from the COLA. I oppose the COLA, but I am deeply saddened that Members of this body may have to cast a vote against the National Center to express their opposition to the COLA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. 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 motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 199, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—229

Ackerman
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne
Pelosi
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Blagojevich
Boswell
Boyd
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Duncan
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
Lampson
Largent
Leach
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Minge
Mink
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wise

NOT VOTING—6

Bonilla
Foglietta
Gonzalez
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Schiff

☐ 1643

Ms. CARSON and Messrs. ADAM SMITH of Washington, LUCAS of Oklahoma, MINGE, WHITFIELD, and SCHUMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KANJORSKI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

☐ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 2, answered ''present'' 6, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
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
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard

Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
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)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Coburn
Shimkus

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—6

Goode
Salmon
Scarborough
Shadegg
Smith, Linda
Souder

NOT VOTING—13

Bonilla
Foglietta
Gonzalez
Hastings (FL)
Hunter
Kaptur
McHale
Miller (CA)
Ney
Pastor
Schiff
Spence
Weldon (PA)

□ 1651

Mr. SALMON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''present.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 436, I was in a meeting and the beeper did not work, and I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KOLBE, WOLF, LIVINGSTON, HOYER, and OBEY.

As additional conferees solely for consideration of titles I through IV of the House bill, and titles I through IV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 342, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—70

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berry
Bonior
Borski
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Doggett
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Harman
Hinchey
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
LaFalce
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Salmon
Sawyer
Scarborough
Shadegg
Slaughter
Souder
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Waxman

NOES—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Flake
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)