

□ 1250

DO NOT DECLARE OPEN SEASON  
ON HYPOCRITS

(Mr. KANJORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I come from the State of Pennsylvania, and we are famous for hunting. I know our chairman on the other side comes from an area not distant from mine, and some of our counties have more deer than people. In Pennsylvania when we have an over population of game, we declare an open hunting season. It seems we may have a lot of hypocrisy and a high population of hypocrits in the House. I hope that does not mean we are going to declare an open season.

INSIST ON OPPORTUNITY TO  
DELIBERATE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Chair and others understand what the concern of Democrats is today about last night. It is not about whether there were 3 minutes on one side and 5 minutes on the other. The concern is that on a very important motion that changed procedure and in fact abrogated the very reforms that were voted through this House on a bipartisan basis only a week earlier, that on that very important measure, the majority did something relatively unprecedented in my memory, which is instead of yielding as something routinely is done half the debate time on that motion to the other side, instead the majority made us grovel for 3 minutes, and it did not matter whether the majority was speaking for 5 or 50 minutes, the message was clear. Three minutes is all you get, wham, bang, and we are out of here, and you are rolled. Unfortunately, that is not going to wash.

I just want everybody to know, I do not mind voting on the Contract With America. I am not here to delay the Contract With America, but I am here to deliberate. So it is not delay that is at issue, it is whether we get to deliberate, and we are going to insist on that.

ARTIFICIAL DEADLINES

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I wanted to correct a mistake which I made last night. I referred to prior rules which prohibited at the objection of any one Member the meeting of a committee while the 5-minute rule was in process. I had not mentioned, in fact I was incorrect in not mentioning, that had been changed

in the last Congress. I want to correct that error of mine. But that does not change my unhappiness with this procedure, particularly now that proxy voting has been done away with.

I face a situation where as a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, I may be asked to be at a hearing and perhaps a markup on the question of guaranteeing the Mexican debt and pushing for the kind of social and taxpayer safeguards I think are important. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I want to be on the floor fully to participate in the balanced budget amendment.

What we are facing is an artificial deadline made as part of a campaign approach, and it is one thing to as part of a campaign approach, and it is one thing to try and meet that. It is quite another to degrade the legislative process to meet this arbitrary deadline. I hope the other side will stop doing that.

ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a good deal of pettiness that has taken place on the House floor today, my Republican colleagues and I look forward to welcoming the President of the United States to the Chamber tonight to deliver his view of the State of the Union. It is most beneficial at the beginning of the legislative year to hear what the President has to say about where we should be going as a Nation and what his program is for the upcoming year.

We would hope that the President would reference what the American people said in November in the way of approving a new Congress, because they said specifically at that time that the Contract With America was something that they believe should be a part of the national agenda.

So some of the way that I will measure and I think a number of my colleagues will measure the President's remarks tonight is how much of the agenda of the Contract With America does the President set forward in his speech this morning. Where is he willing to cooperate with us in moving the Nation ahead. We are hopeful that there will be a large area of cooperation between the President and this Congress so that we can in fact move a national agenda and get away from pettiness and partisanship.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL  
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO  
THREATENED DISRUPTION OF  
MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS  
BY COMMISSION OF GRAVE ACTS  
OF VIOLENCE BY TERRORISTS—  
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS] laid before the House the fol-

lowing message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency with respect to the grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to issue an Executive order that:

—Blocks all property, including bank deposits, of foreign persons or organizations designated in the Executive order or pursuant thereto, which is in the United States or in the control of United States persons, including their overseas branches; and

—Prohibits any transaction or dealing by United States persons in such property, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such designated persons.

I have designated in the Executive order 12 foreign organizations that threaten to use violence to disrupt the Middle East peace process. I have authorized the Secretary of State to designate additional foreign persons who have committed, or pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or who assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material or technical support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. Such designations are to be made in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General.

The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to designate persons or entities that he determines, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, are owned or controlled by, or acting for or on behalf of, any of the foreign persons designated under this order. The Secretary of the Treasury is also authorized to issue regulations in exercise of my authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to implement these measures in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General and to coordinate such implementation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All Federal agencies are directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued. The order was effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time on January 24, 1995.

I have authorized these measures in response to recurrent acts of international terrorism that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process. They include such acts as the bomb attacks in Israel this past weekend and other recent attacks in Israel, attacks on government authorities in Egypt, threats against Palestinian authorities in the autonomous regions, and the bombing of the Jewish Mutual Association building in Buenos Aires, as well as the car bomb at the Israeli Embassy in London.

Achieving peace between Israel and its neighbors has long been a principal goal of American foreign policy. Resolving this conflict would eliminate a major source of instability in a part of the world in which we have critical interests, contribute to the security and well-being of Israel, and strengthen important bilateral relationships in the Arab world.

Attempts to disrupt the Middle East peace process through terrorism by groups opposed to peace have threatened and continue to threaten vital interests of the United States, thus constituting an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Terrorist groups engaging in such terrorist acts receive financial and material support for their efforts from persons in the Middle East and elsewhere who oppose that process. Individuals and groups in the United States, too, have been targets of fundraising efforts on behalf of terrorist organizations.

Fundraising for terrorism and use of the U.S. banking system for transfers on behalf of such organizations are inimical to American interests. Further, failure to take effective action against similar fundraising and transfers in foreign countries indicate the need for leadership by the United States on this subject. Thus, it is necessary to provide the tools to combat any financial support from the United States for such terrorist activities. The United States will use these actions on our part to impress on our allies in Europe and elsewhere the seriousness of the danger of terrorist funding threatening the Middle East peace process, and to encourage them to adopt appropriate and effective measures to cut off terrorist fundraising and the harboring of terrorist assets in their territories and by their nationals.

The measures we are taking demonstrate our determination to thwart acts of terrorism that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process by attacking any material or financial support for such acts that may emanate from the United States.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1995.

#### UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

□ 1256

#### 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, with Mr. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, January 23, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] had been disposed of and section 4 was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to section 4?

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we prepare to return to the unfunded mandates bill or, as some would say, the Son of California Wilderness, I would remind our colleagues that we have now been on this bill for some measure of time, over 10 hours, on nine amendments. I would also point out there has been some discussion here this morning about the majority gagging of the minority. I would emphasize again this is an open rule, a truly open rule, something that we rarely saw in the 103d Congress.

Having said that, though, I think with the fact we have dealt with only nine amendments in over 10 hours and the fact that we have pages of amendments just to section 4 of the bill still pending, I would exhort my colleagues to recognize that there must be an end to this process at some point in time.

I think there are certain major issues that we need to deal with in this legislation. We have been dealing with only one of those major issues thus far, and that is the issue whether certain programs or statutes or dealings in the Federal Government should be exempt from a cost analysis of what they may cost.

That is one issue, and we have debated that at great length over a number of different issues. But I think we have fairly well resolved the fact that the majority has prevailed in saying very little should be exempt from the provisions of this law, except those things that would provide sort of technical reassurance that certain areas

were in fact exempt under civil rights laws or whatever.

This is only one issue. We have other issues like, should the regulations issued by the Government be subject to judicial review, should the effective date be changed, and what do we do with public-private issues. These are all major issues.

So I would hope that we might be able to move this along. And in hopes that we might be able to do that, I ask unanimous consent that debate on all of the exemption amendments to section 4 of the bill be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object because I do not believe that such a request would be appropriate at this time.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, in the committee we had no hearings.

The previous question was ordered on an amendment that had not even been heard or read. We were told to hold off on amendments until we reached the floor. When we agreed not to make a point of order to the bill that would have delayed consideration, the chairman assured us that there is no intent at all to in any way proscribe or limit the ability of Members to offer amendments.

Further, when we went to the Committee on Rules, we were told that we were going to have open debate. Many Members on the other side of the aisle very proudly said, and have even said so today, that, "We are now having open debate. There is going to be no closed rule."

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I sense some resistance on the other side, and I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] withdraws his request.

Are there further amendments to section 4?

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mrs. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments Nos. 30 and 31 at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

#### Amendments offered by Mr. BECERRA:

In section 4(2) insert "age," before "race".  
In the proposed section 422(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, insert "age," before "race".

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on this floor about my concerns with H.R. 5, the unfunded mandates legislation, for a number of reasons,