

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.J. RES. 114, AUTHORIZING USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform our colleagues that today we will be sending a Dear Colleague letter informing Members that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet on Monday, October 7, to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for H.J. Res. 114, authorization for the use of military force against Iraq.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to this joint resolution should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 5 p.m. this Friday, October 4, to the Committee on Rules in room H-312.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the joint resolution as reported by the Committee on International Relations, which is expected to file probably tomorrow. The text will be available on the Web sites of both the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—MAKING CHAPTER 12 FAMILY FARMER BANKRUPTCY PROTECTIONS PERMANENT

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and offer a privileged resolution that I noticed pursuant to rule IX, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

A resolution in accordance with House Rule IX, expressing a sense of the House that its integrity has been impugned and its Constitutional duty hampered by the inability of the House to bring to the floor, a clean bill permanently extending Chapter 12 of title 11 of the U.S. Code which provides bankruptcy protections to family farmers.

Whereas, Chapter 12 of the Federal bankruptcy code was enacted in 1986 as a temporary measure to allow family farmers to repay their debts according to a plan under court supervision, preventing a situation from occurring where a few bad crop years lead to the loss of the family farm; and

Whereas, in the absence of Chapter 12, farmers are forced to file for bankruptcy relief under the Bankruptcy Code's other alternatives, none of which work quite as well for farmers as Chapter 12; and

Whereas, since its creation, the Chapter 12 family farmer bankruptcy protection has been renewed regularly by Congress and has never been controversial; and

Whereas in 1997, the National Bankruptcy Review Commission recommended that Chapter 12 be made permanent; and

Whereas in this Congress, just as in previous Congresses, the larger Bankruptcy Reform Act includes a provision that permanently extends Chapter 12. And, in this Congress, just as in previous Congresses, the larger Bankruptcy Reform Act is a controversial bill whose enactment is an uncertainty; and

Whereas, for 5 years now, family farmers have been held hostage by the contentious debate surrounding the larger bankruptcy issue. For 5 years, the family farmer has been waiting to see if Congress will extend these protections for another few months until we reach the next legislative hurdle on the larger bankruptcy issues; and

Whereas right now, family farmers are making plans to borrow money based on next year's expected harvest in order to be able to buy the seeds needed to plant the crops for that harvest. As these farmers leverage themselves, they need to have the assurance that Chapter 12 family farmer bankruptcy protections are going to be there for them on a permanent basis. Sporadic and temporarily extensions to not do the job.

Now therefore, be it resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should immediately call up for consideration by this body, H.R. 5348, the Family Farmers and Family Fishermen Protection Act of 2002, which will once and for all give family farmers the permanent bankruptcy protections they have been waiting over five years for.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order that the resolution is not privileged under the rules of the House and ask to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may present his point of order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, over the years, both Republican and Democratic Speakers have ruled that questions of privilege may not be used to criticize the legislative process, such as charges of inactivity in regard to a subject reported from committee. This precedent dates back to at least 1974 and has been renewed by Speakers of the House ever since.

The question of privilege that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) raises relates to scheduling of legislation. Just yesterday, the House passed a bill on the subject of family farmer bankruptcy protection, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania supported; and I thank him for that support. But this resolution is definitely not a question of privilege. The issue has been raised with the first alleged resolution of privilege that came up. The question is identical to that on which the Speaker has already ruled and on which the House has tabled an appeal.

I would urge the Speaker to sustain the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, rule IX of the House Rules Manual states that questions of privilege are "those affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, Delegates, or the Resident

Commissioner, individually, in their representative capacity only."

The rights, reputation, and conduct of this Member are negatively affected when the House cannot move legislation that the American people and the vast majority of the Members of this House overwhelmingly support. Chapter 12 of the Federal bankruptcy code was enacted in 1986 as a temporary measure to allow family farmers to repay their debts according to a plan under court supervision, preventing a situation from occurring where a few bad crop years result in the loss of the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, the National Bankruptcy Review Commission recommended that chapter 12 be made permanent. Six times since that recommendation was made, Congress has ignored the advice of the National Bankruptcy Commission and has extended chapter 12 on a temporary basis rather than a permanent basis. I will admit that a permanent extension of chapter 12 has been included in the larger bankruptcy reform bill, but that bill is saddled with great controversy; and despite our efforts to pass it several times in the past 5 years, we still have not had success.

Mr. Speaker, for 5 years now, family farmers have been held hostage by the contentious debate surrounding the larger bankruptcy issue. Right now, family farmers in my congressional district and in other congressional districts are making plans to borrow money based on next year's expected harvest. As these farmers leverage themselves, they need to have the assurance that chapter 12 family farmer bankruptcy protections are going to be there for them on a permanent basis. Sporadic and temporary extensions do not do the job. Immediate consideration of H.R. 5348, the Family Farmers and Family Fishermen Protection Act of 2002, will give family farmers the permanent chapter 12 bankruptcy protection they have been patiently waiting for for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, let me finish by saying I represent over 600,000 constituents, many of whom are family farmers. My rights and those of my constituents are being denied when urgent legislation that has the majority support is blocked from consideration simply because the leadership of this House will not schedule a vote for this bill. As a result, I believe this resolution meets the test of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As the Chair ruled earlier today, a resolution expressing the sentiment that Congress should act on a specified measure does not constitute a question of privileges of the House under rule IX.

The mere invocation of legislative powers provided in the Constitution coupled with a desired policy end does not meet the requirements of rule IX and is really a matter properly initiated through introduction in the hopper under clause 7 of rule XII.