So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3671.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THUNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BIENNIAL REPORT ON HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION CALENDAR YEARS 1996–1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Department of Transportation's Biennial Report on Hazardous Materials Transportation for Calendar Years 1996–1997. The report has been prepared in accordance with the Federal hazardous materials transportation law, 49 U.S.C. 5121(e).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

□ 1730

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THUNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1776, AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–562) on the resolution (H. Res. 460) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1776) to expand homeownership in the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, most Americans possess little knowledge of or experience with the subject of presidential directives. Indeed, even those familiar with executive orders and proclamations may not understand the full impact of these directives on Federal, State, and local laws or on the balance of power in this Nation.

By issuing executive orders, which infringe on congressional authority, it has become increasingly clear that the President is skirting the constitutional process and meddling in the legislative affairs of Congress. The result is a subtle erosion of our representative self-government and the rule of law.

The President seeks to expand his authority beyond what the Constitution allows. He is using directives to seize land, usurp State law, expand the Federal Government, and spend taxpayer dollars without congressional authorization. This definition of executive power would have astonished the framers of our constitution. Their structure of government deliberately rejected the British model, which gave the king all executive authority.

A steady increase in controversy over executive orders and presidential proclamations has arisen since FDR's first administration. Judging by the comments of the White House, we have even more reason to be concerned. Mr. Podesta, the President's Chief of Staff, has outlined the President's plan to issue a series of executive orders and other directives that will become the force and effect of law. Thus, if unchallenged, the President has taken legislative power without first getting the okay from Congress.

Congress should be outraged by the President's staff, as they look for ways to bypass the legislative branch. We have seen this before. When the President issued his Executive Order on striker replacement, he attempted to do what had been denied him by the regular legislative process. In addition, when the President issued his proclamation establishing a national monument in Utah, he again tried to do what he had been unable to do in Congress.

I am deeply concerned with executive lawmaking, and if Congress does not openly challenge the President, we are surely surrendering our liberty. It seems clear that the President plans on using Executive Orders and other presidential directives to implement his agenda without the consent of Congress. Executive lawmaking is a violation of the Constitution and the doctrine of separation of powers. As Article I states, all legislative powers shall be vested in the Congress.

In the legislative veto decision of 1983, the Supreme Court insisted that congressional power be exercised in accord with a single finely wrought and exhaustively considered procedure. The Court said that the records of the Philadelphia Convention and the State ratification debates provide unmistakable expression of a determination that the legislation by the national Congress be a step-by-step deliberate and deliberative process. If Congress is required to follow this rigorous process, how absurd it is to argue that a President can accomplish the same result by unilaterally issuing executive orders or presidential proclamations.

Mr. Speaker, we must not be lulled into complacency. It is time to clarify the scope of executive authority vested in the Presidency by Article II of the Constitution. The Supreme Court has failed to address this issue and it is time for Congress to invoke the powerful weapons at its command. Through its ability to authorize programs and appropriate funds, Congress can define and limit presidential power. As Members, we must participate in our fundamental duty of overseeing executive policies, passing judgment on them, and behaving as the legislative branch should.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, Mr. Speaker.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 the President and I made a Social Security policy announcement with senior citizens in my district. As a result, I was unable to vote in favor of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall 91, the Stearns amendment, no; on rollcall 92, the Paul amendment, no; on rollcall 93, the Tancredo amendment, no; on rollcall 94, on the Motion to Recommit, yes; and on rollcall 95, final passage, yes.

FLUSHING REMONSTRANCE RECOGNIZED AS FOUNDATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the significance of a document that was fundamental in shaping the United States as a land of liberties. I am not speaking about the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution, for that matter. The document I want to recognize is the Flushing Remonstrance, which was written nearly 120 years before the Declaration of Independence.

For 300 years, the Flushing Remonstrance, the first recorded defense of religious freedom in the new world, was locked away in a vault in Albany, New York. The Remonstrance is believed by historians to be the first Declaration of