

States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. CRANE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is necessary to return to the Senate the bill S. 1518, because it contravenes the constitutional requirement that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. S. 1518 would repeal an import restriction found in current law, and therefore contravenes this constitutional requirement.

S. 1518 proposes to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897. Under the act, it is unlawful to import to the United States tea which is substandard, and the importation of all such tea is prohibited, except as provided in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

The repeal of this provision would have a direct effect on customs revenues. The proposed change in our tariff laws is a revenue-affecting infringement on the House's prerogatives, which constitutes a revenue measure in the constitutional sense. Therefore, I am asking that the House insist on its constitutional prerogatives.

There are numerous precedents for the action I am requesting. For example, on July 21, 1994, the House returned to the Senate S. 729, prohibiting the import of specific products which contain more than specified quantities of lead. On February 25, 1992, the House returned to the Senate S. 884, requiring the President to impose sanctions, including import restrictions, against countries that fail to eliminate large-scale driftnet fishing. On October 31, 1991, House returned to the Senate S. 320, including provisions imposing, or authorizing the imposition of, a ban on imports in connection with export administration.

I want to emphasize that this action does not constitute a rejection of the Senate bill on its merits. Adoption of this privileged resolution to return the bill to the Senate should in no way prejudice its consideration in a constitutionally acceptable manner.

The proposed action today is procedural in nature, and is necessary to preserve the prerogatives of the House to originate revenue matters. It makes it clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with revenue measures is for the House to act first on a revenue bill, and for the Sen-

ate to accept it or amend it as it sees fit.

□ 1215

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Does any Member on the minority side seek recognition?

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 165 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 386, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 165 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 165

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 104-99 is further amended by striking out "March 22, 1996" in sections 106(c), 112, 126(c), 202(c), and 214 and inserting in lieu thereof "March 29, 1996", and that Public Law 104-92 is further amended by striking out "March 22, 1996" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "April 3, 1996".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 386, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again today regarding funding for the remaining fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. I do hope that we will have everyone's help to prevent a Government shutdown and allow the House and the Senate con-

feres on the omnibus wrap-up continuing resolution time to close out this fiscal year and get on with the business of the Congress.

On Tuesday evening, the Senate concluded action on H.R. 3019, the omnibus continuing resolution, making a further downpayment toward a balanced budget. This was a big bill in the House because it addressed big problems. In the Senate it became a bigger bill because they added funding for the District of Columbia as well as providing additional funding, with some offsets, for programs in education and the environment.

We have begun analyzing the differences between the House and the Senate bill, and I might add that the Senate amendment is some 933 pages long, so it has taken us some effort to do so, and we are trying to find out additional offsets to pay for these program increases without exceeding our budget allocations. I have talked with Senator HATFIELD, distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in that body, and it is our intention to get together informally this afternoon to begin the process of working out the differences between the two bodies on the omnibus bill. Both of us are asking the administration to join with us in concluding the business of fiscal year 1996 so that we can indeed move on to the pending budget for fiscal year 1997.

I might just point out that regardless of what happens on this bill or subsequent ones, by December 31, 1996, this year, the 104th Congress ceases to exist. It is going to be over. And in the interim we have about 4 months that are going to be predominantly taken up by the election season, if you will. So that really only leaves between now and the middle of September for active, ongoing effort to conclude the business of Congress.

We have got lots of policy initiatives to deal with from the authorizing committees, and we have to conclude the fiscal year 1997 appropriations process, which entails 13 bills which must pass the House, pass the Senate, go to conference, pass both Houses again, and be ultimately sent to the President and signed by the President. That means we have a great deal of business to do for fiscal year 1997, and here we are still contemplating the effort in fiscal year 1996, primarily because the President vetoed three of the bills under consideration and because the fourth bill, the Labor-Health bill, languished in the Senate for some 9 months because our liberal friends over there decided to just filibuster it and keep it from coming up for consideration.

In addition, the District of Columbia bill, which should have been sent to the President a month or two ago, was not because of some few Members' concern about a little \$3 million school voucher program which would allow poor youngsters to go to private schools. They do not want to take on the NEA, the National Education Association, and all of those great stalwart protectionist organizations which protect the