¶31.4 PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

On motion of Mr. GAYDOS, by unanimous consent, the Committee on House Administration was granted permission until midnight, Friday, March 20, 1992, to file a privileged report on the resolution (H. Res. 379) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by standing and select committees of the House in the second session of the One Hundred Second Congress.

¶31.5 WAIVING ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS—H.R. 4210

On motion of Mr. GEPHARDT, by unanimous consent, the House considered the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 446) waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to H.R. 4210 of the 102nd Congress.

When said joint resolution was considered and read twice.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time by title, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said joint resolution was passed was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

Ordered, That the Clerk request the concurrence of the Senate in said joint resolution.

¶31.6 PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

On motion of Mr. MOAKLEY, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules was granted permission until midnight tonight to file a privileged report (Rept. No. 102–460) to accompany the resolution (H. Res. 402) waiving all points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4210) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for increased economic growth and to provide tax relief for families.

¶31.7 RESIGNATION OF THE HOUSE POSTMASTER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Washington, DC, March 19, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS P. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit to you my resignation as Postmaster of the U.S. House of Representatives effective March 19, 1992.

It has been an honor and a pleasure to serve the Members of Congress and this institution for these many years.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. ROTA,
Postmaster.

The resignation was accepted.

¶31.8 POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. LIGHTFOOT rose to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to clause 1 of rule IX, recognized Mr. LIGHTFOOT for one hour.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT made the following statement:

''Mr. Speaker. I rise today because I, like a number of my colleagues, feel that my reputation as a Member of Congress has been damaged by the actions of the House bank and the office of the Sergeant at Arms.

''This weekend, after going through and reviewing my canceled checks from the House bank, I discovered at least 60 that had been held by the bank without their ever notifying me.

''The key word is ''held.'' They were not bounced. My monthly statements have been juggled by the House bank, so I never knew the actions they had taken.

''For whatever reason, as most of you know, we are paid by the Sergeant at Arms. Our checks are issued on the 30th of the month. they are to be deposited to our account the following day, which is the 1st of the next month. But for whatever reason, many times those paychecks were not credited to my account for 4 or 5 or 6 days after the 1st of the month. I assumed that my paycheck was where it was supposed to be, in my account, under my name.

''Specifically, the House bank frequently held checks for 4 to 6 days. In one instance the House bank held my tax refund check. Now, this is a check from the U.S. Treasury, which we assume is good. They held it for 5 days, or 6 days, actually, before they credited it to my account.

''Assuming that my refund was in my bank account, I continued to write checks against the account. As those came in the House bank held them. They did not bounce them, they held them.

''As an old ex-police officer, a few flags started to fly as things started to unfold. First of all, as more and more Members are talking about their personal experiences, we find that there is a common theme that has developed through much of what is being said.

''That is, that deposits, for whatever reason, were not credited at the time they were put in the House bank.

''I have had colleagues tell me of 15 days since the time they went down and made the deposit to the time it was credited to their account, 15 days expired. Had this been a real bank, I am sure that the Federal examiners would have closed it down. But the big question, I guess, that comes to my mind, and the one that I think has to be answered, what or who was doing what with our money when it was not credited to our accounts?

''Where did my paycheck go on the first of July, when I did not get credit for it until the fifth? Was it credited to somebody else's account? Was it used to cover the deficits of those known abusers that we have here which have been uncovered through the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, where we reconstructed some 66 accounts and found abusers, that there is proof that they did in fact abuse the bank and deliberately wrote overdrafts month after month after month? Were they using my money to cover those overdrafts and then holding my check until enough of them came in the bank that decided, well, we better pay up on this guy? So they paid my checks and then reached over to this gentleman's or this gentleman's account and took some more money out? What were they doing with that money?

''To me that is the key question that needs to be answered at this point in time. I tried to explain this to the media back home. I have a tape recording of the news conference that we held, and I certainly did not say what the headline says.

''It says, 'I Bounced 60, But It Wasn't My Fault.'

''I never said that, but that is what the news media chose to write. Also in the roughly 7 years that we have been in this House, we have, I think, done a few decent things for our State. We saved a major highway that was going into another State. We have got a lot of improvements going on roads and airports and waterways and sewer systems and rural water districts and so on. Never made the front page of this newspaper. But with this little cartoon, wherever it went, we finally got on the front page for something that we did not do.

''The irony of it is that there is a feeding fest going on because for some reason the whole judicial system has been turned around, as it pertains to Members of Congress. We are all guilty until we prove ourselves innocent, and then every time we try to explain it, we are just trying to cover up and blame it on somebody else. I think there is a way that we can get to this central question and we can do it very quickly.

''Today I am going to send a letter around to the entire House membership. In that letter I am going to ask them to join me in requesting the U.S. Attorney's Office to undertake a criminal investigation of the House bank. Yes, I said criminal investigation of the House bank. Because for one, I want to know where were my deposits when they were not in my account. What was that money used for?

''It is my understanding that there is something in the neighborhood of a $2 million a day float. Where did the interest off of that money go? These are the questions that the folks in the Press Gallery should be asking, rather than trying to skewer Members of Congress simply because we chose to get in this job and someone mishandled our personal finances for us.

''I am certain there are Members who did write overdrafts, and I would be hard-pressed, I think, to find anybody that could say 100 percent that they had not because we all do make mistakes. But when an institution of the House takes individual Members and juggles their financial accounts around, for whatever the reason might be, be in just plain laziness and sloppiness or be it for criminal reasons, that is wrong. Particularly when it smears the reputations and the names or Republicans and Democrats alike, who