

league from Texas and I are making. This is truly a question of privilege because the reputation of the House and its dignity would be forever harmed if we fail to act and to honor our obligations.”.

Mr. EDWARDS was recognized and said:

“Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my point. I think this resolution does deal with the integrity of this House in a very significant way. Unless I am mistaken, it was not too many years ago when colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle of this House came to this floor and argued that we should have privileged resolutions and measures to consider the so-called House bank scandal, because a number of House Members had purportedly bounced thousands of dollars of personal checks.

“I would suggest to the Speaker and to our colleagues that if having Members of this House bounce thousands of dollars in personal checks goes directly to the integrity of this House, how in the world could we not conclude that having the U.S. Government for the first time in two centuries bounce billions of dollars of checks to people to whom we owe money, and entities all across this world, an action that would undermine the integrity of our creditworthiness and our reputation as a nation, how can the personal bounced checks go directly to the integrity of the House and not have our Nation’s bouncing checks go to the integrity of the House?

“I would argue, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution clearly deals directly with the question of protecting the integrity and the dignity of this House, and would suggest that to rule otherwise might be inconsistent with the arguments we heard from our Republican colleagues just a few years ago.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. COMBEST, ruled that the resolution submitted did not present a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX, and said:

“The resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas alleges that the failure of the House to take specified legislative actions brings it discredit, impairs its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings, and lowers it in public esteem. On that premise it resolves that the House be considered to have passed two legislative measures.

“Under rule IX, questions of the privileges of the House are those ‘affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, [or] the integrity of its proceedings.’ But a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to effect a change in the rules of the House or to prescribe a special order of business for the House. This principle has been upheld on several occasions cited in section 664 of the ‘House Rules and Manual,’ including March 11, 1987; August 3, 1988; and, in particular, June 27, 1974—where a resolution directing the Committee on Rules to consider report-

ing a special order was held not to present a question of privilege.

“The resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas—like those offered on February 7 and December 22, 1995, and on January 3, 1996—is also aptly addressed by the precedent of May 6, 1921. On that occasion Speaker Gillett held that a resolution presenting a legislative proposition as a question of constitutional privilege under the 14th amendment did not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House. The Chair will quote briefly from the 1921 ruling:

[W]here the Constitution orders the House to do a thing, the Constitution still gives the House the right to make its own rules and do it at such time and in such manner as it may choose. And it is a strained construction \* \* \* to say that because the Constitution gives a mandate that a thing shall be done, it therefore follows that any Member can insist that it shall be brought up at some particular time and in the particular way which he chooses. If there is a constitutional mandate, the House ought by its rules to provide for the proper enforcement of that, but it is still a question for the House how and when and under what procedure it shall be done \* \* \*.

“Speaker Gillett’s ruling is fully recorded in Cannon’s Precedents, at volume 6, section 48.

“Applying the precedent of 1921 and the others just cited, the Chair holds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas does not affect ‘the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, [or] the integrity of its proceedings’ within the meaning of clause 1 of rule IX. Rather, it proposes to effect a special order of business for the House—deeming it to have passed two legislative measures—as an antidote for the alleged discredit of previous inaction thereon. The resolution does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

“To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.”.

#### ¶6.8 UNFINISHED BUSINESS--APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. COMBEST, pursuant to clause 5, rule I, announced the unfinished business to be the question on agreeing to the Chair’s approval of the Journal of Tuesday, January 23, 1996.

The question being put, viva voce, Will the House agree to the Chair’s approval of said Journal?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. COMBEST, announced that the yeas had it.

So the Journal was approved.

#### ¶6.9 WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(B) OF RULE XI

Mr. MCINNIS, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported (Rept. No. 104-453) the resolution (H. Res. 342)

waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of Rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rule.

When said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

#### ¶6.10 BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 23:

H.R. 1606. An Act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the “Harry Kizirian Post Office Building.”

H.R. 2061. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, Oregon, as the “David J. Wheeler Federal Building.”

#### ¶6.11 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Ms. WATERS, for today and balance of the week.

And then,

#### ¶6.12 ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, at 8 o’clock p.m., the House adjourned.

#### ¶6.13 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2100. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the coastal barrier resources system, with an amendment (Rept. No. 104-452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 342. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. No. 104-453). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### ¶6.14 PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2872. A bill to authorize substitution for drawback purposes of certain types of fibers and yarns for use in the manufacture of carpets and rugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2873. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the collection and use by the Department of Defense of individual genetic identifying information to the purpose of identification of remains, other than when the consent of the individual concerned is obtained; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 2874. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary steps to nego-