Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, April 2, 1993*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our hearts are grateful, O God, with the knowledge that with every weakness, there is also strength; that with every pain, there is also healing; with every discouragement, there is also hope; with dying, there is the gift of eternal life. May Your good spirit so live in our lives, and may Your peace touch our very hearts, that we will not yield to disappointment or see only the problems that lead to despair, but learn to trust in Your way and move forward in that confidence that You alone can give. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 155, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—155

Allard
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clay
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murphy
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—38

Beilenson
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Chapman
Cooper
DeFazio
Dingell
Fields (TX)
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Henry
Hoke
Huffington
Johnson, Sam
LaFalce
Lantos
Lloyd
Manton
McCurdy
Morella
Neal (NC)
Pelosi

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Pombo	Smith (IA)	Tucker
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Whitten
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Sundquist	Young (FL)
Sanders	Swett	

□ 1124

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on a rollcall that occurred during my leave of absence on account of illness in the family, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 134.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would invite the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] to come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WELDON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 239. An act to amend the Stock Raising Homestead Act to resolve certain problems regarding subsurface estates, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce to the House that, by agreement between the majority and the minority, the Chair will recognize 10 Members on each side for 1-minute speeches.

REPUBLICAN GUARDIANS OF GRIDLOCK

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, here they go again. The Republicans on the other side of the Capitol are holding us all hostage with their partisan griping and filibustering. They lost the ball game last November and they are still trying to force us into overtime.

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would admonish the gentleman from California and the Members of the House that such references to the other body or characterizing their actions are not permissible under the House rules.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the GOP has become the GOG, guardians of gridlock. The President has a strategy and a plan to create jobs, reduce the deficit, and produce long-term economic growth. It has earned the overwhelming support of American people. The House passed the plan and Democrats in the other body are ready to do the same.

But where are the Republicans? They are still guarding the gridlock. Listen to what Americans are saying, my friends. A constituent of mine put it well when they wrote and said, "Under President Clinton's capable leadership we Americans have a rare opportunity to get our economic house in order, thus ensuring a better future for our children. Please do your best," they wrote, "to prevent business as usual from wrecking any plan to get America back on track."

Did you hear that, Republicans? Stop the business as usual. Stop guarding the gridlock.

ENERGY INITIATIVES, THE JOINT VENTURES BETWEEN AMERICA AND RUSSIA

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus on a very important part of the upcoming Russian summit with President Clinton, and that deals with energy initiatives, joint venture opportunities between American corporations and our Russian counterparts, our Russian enterprises.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Texas, GREG LAUGHLIN, and I are today hosting a conference with all the major American petrochemical corporations to try to focus on ways to expedite joint venture opportunities that do not involve American tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend on this point now, in the hopes that we can convince the President to raise this issue at the upcoming summit.

□ 1130

Mr. LAUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and would point out to our colleagues that this is a bipartisan effort. We have had the support of the President.

Our companies have been challenged, and we in Congress need to give leadership to this issue to be sure that our companies can do business as we try to help the Soviet Union—or the former Soviet Union republics develop an energy industry, so that we do not have to rely upon American tax dollars.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Chair announced that he was limiting 1-minutes to 10 on each side because of an agreement between the majority and the minority. And I checked with the minority leader, and there was no such agreement. Will the Chair enunciate this issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker's staff advised the Chair earlier today that this was done by agreement.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there was no such agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the Chair's understanding was that this was done by agreement.

DO WE REALLY WANT NAFTA?

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, so you still want to support the North American Free Trade Agreement? How many Members here watched Prime Time Live last night, one of the worst episodes that I have seen where they talked about 19 babies in Mexico who died, born without brains, caused by encephalitis, caused by toxic waste, and they live along the Rio Grande River.

Why did this happen? Because of the toxic waste that is dumped into the river by, who else? American companies who have gone to Mexico to get out from under having to be subjected to EPA rules and regulations. And besides, there they can hire cheap labor at an average of $40 a week.

Where did the American companies locate? Right across the Rio Grande River, folks, the same area where the babies were born without brains.

You still want to vote for the North American Free-Trade Agreement? You better think about it.

IT'S CALLED PORKBUSTING, NOT GRIDLOCK

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a member of the Democrat leadership who just took this well to criticize Republicans for standing firm against pork barrel spending.

This great economic stimulus package that you have touted includes bike paths in Puerto Rico, cemeteries, and fish atlases. It is pure pork, and the Republicans who are fighting this are porkbusters.

Our duty to the American people as Republicans is to stand firm against shams, and the Democrat economic package is a sham.

KING ASSASSINATION

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this weekend, our Nation lost Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a great leader and a hero to many. I lost a friend.

Dr. King showed this Nation and our world a better way—peace, nonviolence, and love. His was a message we need today. Our cities are becoming jungles. People are afraid to go out at night. There is no appreciation for human life. Today, more than ever, we need the spirit of the movement that Dr. King led.

Dr. King and the movement he led reshaped the world in which we live. It moved us closer to the beloved community, which I believe we all seek—a world community of justice, human fulfillment, and love, where, as Dr. King put it, people are judged not by the color of their skin, their place of worship, where they live, their sex or sexual orientation, but only by the content of their character.

We still have a distance to go. Dr. King's message can help us get there. Dr. King gave us hope in a time of hopelessness. He gave us courage when we had every reason to be discouraged. When "our feet were tired," he gave us strength.

He brought people together—black people, white people; Protestant, Catholic, and Jew; young, old; rich and poor—he brought them all together to do good.

As we remember Dr. King, we must remember all that he stood for. Now, more than ever.

PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT FOR RUSSIA

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Clinton delivered an important speech concerning his proposal for a massive infusion of American foreign aid to Russia.

While I share the belief that a stable Russian democracy is a critical element of a more peaceful future, I do not believe that we can throw money at the problems of Russia. Already, one of Russia's greatest economic problems is the need to pay off loans from European nations that were never used wisely.

President Clinton spoke of the money he intends to spend on Russian aid as an investment in the future. For this to be true, this investment should meet the standards of any good investment—it should anticipate a positive return in the future, it should be collateralized in some way, and it should be based on good business judgment.

I have serious doubts about the Federal Government's ability to make these types of decisions. That's why I would prefer that we try to help Russia by private sector investment and increased trade opportunities.

This will protect American taxpayers and contribute to the long-run economic transformation and stability of Russia.

FREE TRADE FOR JAPAN

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, after millions of lost jobs and thousands of factories shut down, the Commerce Department now tells us that Japan and Europe are ripping us off with illegal trade. Wow. Guess what they also said? Our voluntary restraints programs did not work, our memorandums of understanding are a joke, and the side bar agreements are ridiculous.

No kidding, Sherlock? What is next? The only free trade I see is free for Japan. How many more workers have to be ripped off by Japanese trade practices?

I say it is time for Congress, who has been a bunch of wimps on American jobs, to take care and balance the budget by stopping illegal trade and putting the American workers back to work. That is the best way to do it, not give money to Russia and now expand the debt limit.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have suffered in this Chamber for 12 years watching some of my good colleagues on the other side bash Presidents Reagan and Bush in this well, and they always said they did it in the interest of constructive criticism. So, let me give a little constructive criticism to the Clinton White House.

There is a front page story in today's paper in which the President is not just putting a spin on something up at the Naval Academy at Annapolis, but is trampling on the truth. If he does this from ignorance, then he had better correct it.

He said yesterday at Annapolis that no one on his staff told Lt. Gen. Barry McCaffery. "I don't talk to military people." This incident is true. It did happen. It is not in dispute. I have spoken to many of the principles. Our highest-ranking four-star has spoken to the President about it, and the President reportedly told him, "I wish I knew who she was, so I could have a little chat with her." He should do more than that. He should find out who she is and fire her.

It is now incumbent upon everyone in this House to know that Barry McCaffery has three Purple Hearts, four Bronze Stars for valor, two Silver Stars and two Distinguished Service Crosses. He was the point of the spear in the Persian Gulf, Operation Desert Storm, as Commander of the 24th Mechanized Infantry. He led the "Hail Mary" into Iraq.

Barry McCaffery: West Point graduate, airborne ranger paratrooper, Vietnam and Desert Storm veteran, husband and father with a combat infantryman son and combat nurse daughter—also both Desert Storm veterans. True Story, The President: lying or insufferably ignorant.

□ 1140

FAIR ACCESS TO JAPANESE MARKETS

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning national public radio said the "U.S. received good economic news," when it described the continued fall of the dollar versus the Japanese yen. Wrong. That is the conventional wisdom, but the United States-Japan trade relationship is not conventional and neither is the Japanese economy conventional.

Supposedly the falling dollar will help the United States trade deficit with Japan and that is why the administration has been jawboning down the dollar. Many economists agree with that effort, but they are wrong. The result will only be that the American people will be poorer and our country will be weaker. Contrary to prediction, this move will not correct the huge, unfavorable trade balance we have with the Japanese.

Why is that? First, Japan has no natural resources. It imports all of the raw materials for its products and many manufactured components. The stronger yen will mean that many of those imports for its manufacturing sector will be less expensive, even though they come not only from the United States but from all over Southeast Asia and elsewhere. Second, American businesses trying to break into Japanese domestic markets will find the extraordinarily high cost of doing business in Japan now astronomically high. Third, look at the big-ticket Japanese

exports to the United States. When it comes to electronic consumer goods, Americans walking into Circuit City are unfortunately still not price sensitive. They will plunk down their dollars and buy the Japanese product they want. And, the Japanese will continue to find ways to reduce the cost of their exports to the United States by charging their own consumers and consumers in other countries more to sustain their American markets. Yes, with this exchange rate, automobiles made in Japan will be more expensive. Guess what will happen. Automobile companies in America—domestic and Japanese—will take this opportunity to raise their prices. American car buyers get hit no matter what they buy.

Talking the dollar down, with the resulting higher value yen, will not appreciably cut Japanese exports to the United States. And Japan, cited yesterday by the annual United States Government report as the country with the most unfair trade barriers to United States products and services, will not really buy appreciably more United States imports. America should have learned its lesson from the Plaza accord. A weaker dollar is not the solution, it is disastrous economic and trade policy. The United States must be tough in demanding actual, fair access to Japanese markets and it must do everything possible to assure that American businesses have the confidence of fair access in order to invest resources to capture Japanese markets and afford to do business there.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge Secretary Bentsen and the Clinton administration to reverse this tragic policy. The conventional wisdom does not apply to Japanese-American trade and economic relationships.

GRIDLOCK

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, folks, here we go again. Gridlock.

You know, last year, as our President campaigned throughout this country, everyone looked forward to his economic package that he was going to deliver to the House and the Senate, which he has done. Part of that economic package, the budget part, has been passed. We in the House have passed the stimulus package. It now sits over in the Senate.

The minority over there has thwarted the will of the majority, refusing to permit it to come to a vote.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would remind the gentleman and Members of the House that it is not correct to characterize actions taken by the other body.

The gentleman is recognized. He may continue.

Mr. VOLKMER. Gridlock. That is all it is. Abuse of the rules of the Senate, abuse of the Congress by not permitting this matter that we need to come to a vote.

Just now, just today, we learned that the economy is stagnating again. Just now when we need that stimulus package to make sure it keeps going, who stops it? The minority in the Senate. They say, "Let the country go to pot." Gridlock.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired, and, again, the Chair does not wish to be tiresome on this point, but it is very clear that Members today seem to be indulging in an effort to characterize the actions of the other body, in violation of rule XIV. Actions of the other body are not to be characterized in the House of Representatives.

FRESHMAN MEMBERS AS REFORMERS NOT CONFORMERS

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Capitol Hill magazine Roll Call put out its annual April Fools Day edition. Let me read you some of the headlines: "House Bank to Reopen, Foley Says"; "Three New Select Committees OK'd"; and "Golf Course Is Planned for Grounds of the Capitol."

Although the folks at Roll Call meant this as a joke, I would not be surprised if a group of freshman Democrats did not read this—caucus, and immediately draft a letter to Speaker FOLEY pledging their support for these proposals.

After all, when the House leadership has said jump, the freshman Democrats have perked up and asked "how high?"

That is what happened when the Democratic leadership kept their freshman from showing up at the Omaha summit. And that is why the freshman Democrats were no-shows on the fight to retire the select committees.

And just this week the freshman Democrats showed all the tenacity of a herd of sheep when they issued their milk toast, window dressing House reform plan. Their plan is so watered down, it doesn't even represent a real position to begin negotiating on.

Mr. Speaker, the American people sent 110 new Members to Congress so we could have real change. Unfortunately, Democratic leadership have sucked their freshman into the new old system. The freshman Democrats have been conformers, not reformers.

We freshman Republicans are committed to keeping up the fight for reform. But we cannot succeed alone.

It is time for the freshman Democrats to break the trance their leadership has put on them, remember what they campaigned on, and start doing what the American people sent them to: make real changes in Congress.

STIMULUS PACKAGE HELPS CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about that stuck stimulus package.

Let me talk about what they are labeling as pork. What they are labeling as pork is America's commitment to finally immunizing its children. We have the worst record in the industrialized world.

President Bush promised to change it at the world summit on children and did not. It is time we do it and do it now.

What is another item? It is full funding for Head Start. We promised to do that 30 years ago. We never did it. Let us do that now.

It is about jobs this summer for our youth that have been so forgotten, and they are in so much trouble.

These are the pork barrel issues they are talking about. You all know the great PAC contributions these kids have given.

This is absolutely essential. We always talk about our natural resources. This is a stimulus package that talks about our human resources, and it is time that we get this out. If we do not, I think it is time we go to a unicameral legislature.

DEMOCRATS GET THE CREDIT

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Be proud, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, for the work that we have done in this brief session of the Congress.

I want you to have all the credit for it. I do not want to reach out and claim any credit for it.

You have, in the past few days, passed an outline for the largest tax increase in the history of this Nation. Be proud of that.

We are struggling with a pork-laden so-called stimulus package that will add $16 billion to the national deficit before Easter. Be proud of that.

We raised the debt limit yesterday to the highest it has ever been in history. Be proud of that.

Today we will pass a phony line-item veto designed to fool the American people and make them think there is a line-item veto when there really is not. Again, be proud, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

But pardon me if I am not.

A PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton and Russian President Yeltsin meet this weekend, they will be discussing Russia's fledgling democracy, and that country's desperate need for foreign assistance.

Because the United States proposes to be a partner in Russia's democratic development, I feel it is incumbent upon us to remind President Yeltsin that a true democracy promotes freedom both at home and abroad.

Even as we extend aid to our Russian friends, there have been reports that the Russian Government is extending supplier credits to the totalitarian regime in Cuba so that it can complete construction of a nuclear powerplant at Cienfuegos. This plant may pose a real danger both to the people of Cuba, and here at home. An accident at the Cienfuegos plant could wreak havoc not only in Cuba, but it is estimated that winds could spread radioactive pollutants over Florida, the Gulf States and as far as Texas in only 4 days.

Cuba is a signatory nation to neither the Non-Proliferation Treaty nor the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which permit the International Atomic Energy Agency to monitor signatory nation's nuclear facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to register their support for President Clinton's pledge to express our concerns to President Yeltsin at their meeting this weekend. The Russian democratic movement must make itself manifest in Russian foreign policy. Our partnership with the Russian people must continue to be a partnership for peace.

PASS A TRUE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed and disappointed in this system; 110 new Members and we have almost no reform.

What are we going to do here today? We are going to pass what is seen as a so-called enhanced rescission bill. What a misnomer.

This reduces the days that the Congress has to approve a rescission.

We still have to vote to approve the President's rescission. It does nothing.

Freshman Members, conservatives on the Democratic side of the aisle, you cannot hide behind such a sham. I have more faith in the wisdom of the American people to know the difference.

If you want to represent, and that is what we are sent here for, say no to House Resolution 1578 and do it right. Pass a true line-item veto.

Your voters will appreciate it.

EQUAL EDUCATION FUNDING ACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for your support of the Equal Education Funding Act of 1993. This bill will change the way the Federal Government funds education for our students who are most in need.

The current formula shortchanges more than 3 million students nationwide.

There is also a $235 million supplemental appropriation in the stimulus package and not one penny of that money helps to solve the overall problem caused by the current formula.

The bill will: First, provide for annual updates in census numbers used for chapter 1 education funding. Second, creates a formula that recognizes each States ability to pay for education and rewards States who put more of their resources in education.

By cosponsoring the Equal Education Funding Act you will be stating the value you place on classroom teachers because their salaries are part of the formula and you will be telling the States that the Federal Government will no longer disregard the differences among the States in funding education.

The bottom line is this: chapter 1 education funds should go to the students who most need them. This bill does that far better than our current formula and therefore it deserves your support.

□ 1150

TRIBUTE TO HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

(Mr. CASTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, at 2 o'clock this afternoon, in the small town of Cheswold, in the heart of Kent County, DE, J. Caleb Boggs will be laid to rest. This extraordiary man was beyond question the most popular elected official in Delaware's history. A judge, a Governor, a Member of the House, and a U.S. Senator, he was usually addressed simply as Cale. It just fit better than titles.

A Republican by registration, he was equally beloved by people of all political persuasions and backgrounds. His passing is a great loss to his children, his family, and also a great loss to everyone who ever knew him.

To those who would search for competency and decency in politics, Cale Boggs is the best example you will ever find.

Thanks for everything you stood for, Cale, and Godspeed.

LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, since I was elected I have taken to this floor several times to make a statement that some people find surprising coming from someone who represents an inner city, majority Hispanic district.

I have said it is time to put fiscal sanity back in our budget process by passing the line-item veto.

Why is a line-item veto important to America?

Because today, every dollar is precious.

Because every time this Congress misappropriates $1, every time a lobbyist lures some spending their way that benefits just a few of them, instead of all of us, the people of America suffer.

Every dollar wasted means $1 fewer that will be spent on immunization of children, $1 fewer to put extra police protection in our communities, $1 fewer to improve access to health care or help create jobs or improve the schools in our neighborhoods.

Fighting against the reality of limited resources, we are all trying to do the most that we can for our constituents.

If we stand together today, and fight for a strong line-item veto, we will be able to stand stronger tomorrow, and make the changes in our neighborhoods that our constituents want.

POLL SHOWS MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF CLINTON ECONOMIC PACKAGE

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the latest Wirthlin poll, released this week, March 30, 1993, reports on the understanding of the American people of the Clinton economic package.

According to the poll, 71 percent of those polled believe that the plan should include fewer taxes while another 66 percent believe that it should include more spending cuts.

If this is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker, this is not what the American people are getting.

In fact, 53 percent of those polled did not know that plan includes $250 billion in new Government spending increases over the next 5 years.

Additionally, the last question on the poll addressed the action they desired from the Congress on the budget. Given the option of a tax increase or cutting

deficit spending across the board, a budget freeze, 78 percent—an emphatic figure—demanded the freeze.

Mr. Speaker, my budget proposal mirroring this desire received 122 votes on the floor of this House. I am hopeful that there will be another chance for the American people to be more successfully represented by this body.

CONDITION OF ORPHANS, ROMANIAN TRADE STATUS SHOULD BE LINKED

(Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution that links Romania's most-favored-nation trade status with substantial improvement in the conditions for children in Romanian orphanages and less restrictive Romanian adoption policies.

Three years after the notorious Communist dictator was thrown from office, conditions remain intolerable for more than 80,000 Romanian children who are in orphanages, many of which are little more than medieval asylums.

While some human rights abuses have been stopped, the Romanian Government still refers to many of these children as unsalvageables. We can't pretend Romania is moving toward a true democracy as long as these conditions and policies continue.

When we consider MFN status for Romania, we must insist that the Romanian Government do more to save these children. Romania shouldn't expect normal relations with other nations until it takes major steps to end the abuse and neglect endured by its abandoned children and makes it easier for Americans and others to bring hope to these children's lives through adoption.

GRIDLOCK, OR GREASELOCK?

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have one question: Is it gridlock, or is it greaselock? Is it gridlock because the minority party wants to debate the merits of a $3 billion tax increase? Is it gridlock because the Republicans want to debate the fact that the new package has $2.50 in tax increases for every $1 in cut? Is it gridlock because the minority party wants to debate the merits of raising the debt ceiling $225 billion, which is 2½ times the annual budget of the State of California and over 30 times the annual budget of the State of Georgia? Is it gridlock because we want to debate the necessity of a stimulus package that has $28 million for the city of Washington, DC, to retire their debt, $23 million for Fortune 500 companies to learn more about energy efficiency as if Ford Motor Co. really needs the money, $1.4 million to draw pictures of statues; $3.2 million for sickle fin chub?

Is it gridlock, or is it greaselock?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. The Chair had announced that there would be 10 speeches on each side. Would the Chair tell me how many speeches there have been on each side thus far?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There have been 11 on each side. The Chair had, by agreement, once again with the minority and the majority, agreed to take four additional speakers on each side.

Mr. WALKER. Was that announcement made to the membership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The announcement was not made to the membership, but the arrangement was agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry: There were a number of our people who were there and got up and left when the Chair made his announcement. They counted the seats and then they got up and left the floor. I noticed that on this side nobody got up and left, they stayed in their seats, and now because of that we have evidently extended the period or extended the numbers.

So, my parliamentary inquiry is: Why was an announcement not made so that everybody could have participated? It is just passing strange that the Democrats are going to end up with more speakers than the Republicans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would first of all address the gentleman: The Chair himself was approached by Members from the Democratic side who left, having seen the original order. So this may have been a problem for both sides.

But, furthermore, the Cloakrooms were notified of the additional change in adding four more speakers on each side in the 1-minute recognitions.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry: The Chair announced earlier that this had been done in consultation with the minority leadership. I talked to the minority leader, as did Mr. BURTON, and we found out the minority leader was not contacted.

Maybe his staff was. But you know, there seems to be a problem here in the first place. And then, second, if we are going to have these limitations, then the limitations need to be fairly applied, and it cannot be worked out midstream because you have people coming to the floor to make their 1-minute speeches and when they hear that announcement, they leave. That is not fair to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that, in the Chair's opinion, this has been handled with eminent fairness and with complete equity on both sides of the aisle. But if there is a way to do it better, we will always endeavor to do so.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and I think the leadership and the Speaker should let the membership know, especially those who take the time to come over to be involved in the process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will convey the information from both sides to the Speaker.

□ 1200

FRESHMAN DEMOCRATIC REFORM PACKAGE

(Mr. FINGERHUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor originally to address the body on the subject of the Freshman Democratic reform package.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] my co-chairman, on her remarks; but I must say that I have to change the focus today because I have been gravely disturbed by the remarks last night of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and by the gentleman from Minnesota today who have tried to inject partisanship into the subject of congressional reform.

Mr. Speaker, more important than reform, the voters back home want us to conduct our business in a civil manner. They want us to work together for the best interests of the public.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the Republican freshman class knows that. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] met with us, the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] and I, to work together and to emphasize the common ground.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this freshman Democratic reform package. We emphasize campaign finance reform and lobbying reform as the way to clean up this House and make sure that the special interests are not heard over the public interests.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the well-meaning Members on both sides to reject those people who wish to make addresses in the form of a partisan issue and emphasize the common ground.

CIVILITY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is awfully easy to talk about civility when you are able to ramrod everything you want through this House without even paying any attention to the minority.

The Rules Committee has passed nothing but closed rules this whole year, which means that the 600,000 people that each one of us represents are being gagged because they will not even allow us to bring amendments to the floor.

Do you know why? Because they do not want us to tell the American people about what they are doing.

They say it is an economic stimulus package. It is called a pork-barrel package. That is what it really is, and there is $16 billion worth of special pork-barrel projects; movie theaters, swimming pools, parking garages, libraries, sporting arenas. That is not what the American people want their tax dollars going for, and yet these people over here continue to say, "civility, civility," while they ram things down the throats of the minority and the American people.

We do not need $400 billion in new taxes. We need to cut government spending, the pork you are ramming through.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair will have to remind our friends in the gallery, we are happy that you are with us, but it is improper under the House rules for members of the gallery to take part in demonstrations or acts of approval or disapproval of anything taking place on the House floor.

REPUBLICANS AND THE FUTURE FOR OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. BARLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker has pointed out pork.

Let me say this. It was the Republican Party in the Community Development Block Grant Program that insisted back in 1981 that any oversight by the appropriations process be uncoupled from the Community Development Block Grant Program, and it is their fault if there are going to be problems with community development block grants.

Let me say further, I would point out to the children of our Nation that last night they heard some very irresponsible language coming from the Republican side, some very irresponsible advice which I would hope in their lifetimes they steer clear of, and that it is all right to quadruple the national debt, it is all right under Republican leadership to quadruple the national debt because when it is up there you can walk away from it. That was the advice the Republicans gave us last night.

I certainly hope in the future the children of America disavow that.

REPUBLICAN DISCIPLINE

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am getting sick and tired of hearing on this floor about the last 12 years and the quadrupling of the debt, because it was a Democrat Congress that passed every one of those bills, and they know it; but this 4 years is going to be even worse under your own President's projections. Your own President under the best of scenarios projects that he is going to increase the national debt by $916 billion, if everything goes right. That is $183 billion over the first term of Ronald Reagan. That is $283 billion over Ronald Reagan's second term.

This package that is in my judgment being responsibly stopped in the Senate is going to add to the debt, add to the burden, increase the deficit and destroy our economy.

I welcome what the Senate is doing. I hope the American people appreciate it. They are finally putting some discipline in that body.

GRIDLOCK AND REFORM

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I came here initially with the idea of talking about the freshman rules of reform package.

I have listened to the debate for the past 2 days, I must say that I have got to talk about gridlock. I thought it was over, but apparently it is back again.

The public does not want gridlock. They do not want rhetoric. What the public wants is action, and the Democrats in the House have given the public action on major public policy initiatives and we are going to continue to do that.

When I see the gentleman from Indiana unroll his paper about pork and not one of the items that he has on his list is in the bill, I know we have rhetoric and not truth.

We are going to have action today on one of the most fundamental things in Congress, that is the line-item veto that will cut spending. We have action at last.

Mr. Speaker, when I decided to run for Congress last year, I did so because I wanted to create real change in Congress. The people on New Jersey's Eighth Congressional District elected me to help make our Government more responsive and more accountable.

The freshman Democratic reform package will create change by making this Congress more responsive fiscally through fundamental reform in campaign financing and the role of lobbies, and through changes in the way we function. As we freshmen came to Washington, some told us that we should allow the more experienced Members to make the changes. But through our reform package, we are showing that we believe we have something concrete to offer.

This Congress must pass campaign finance reform. We propose spending limits, restrictions on soft money, and limits on pacs.

In the area of fiscal responsibility, this Congress must also reduce spending. We are recommending a 25-percent cut in the legislative branch over 5 years. To eliminate wasteful spending, we have endorsed a statutory line-item veto which gives the President the authority to further cut any wasteful Government spending. We may be new, but we hope all Members from both sides of the aisle will join us in looking for more spending cuts whenever and wherever we can find them. The bottom line is that we will be getting the job of the Government done.

MORE TAXES AND MORE SPENDING

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, yes, we need action, and yes, we need an end to gridlock. I believe that.

And yes, Republicans as well as Democrats have responsibility for the budget deficits.

President Clinton, however, promised that he would represent change and that he was going to end gridlock.

What I find fascinating is that his program is really nothing more than the same old philosophy in George Bush's and the Democrats' 1990 budget summit agreement—more taxes more spending and higher deficits and greater debt.

Mr. Speaker, that is neither effective action nor an end to gridlock. That is business as usual.

How in the world can we increase the debt by a trillion dollars under the President's plan and have annual budget deficits of $228 billion after 5 years of huge tax increases and expect the American public to greet those results with any sort of positive attitude?

The Clinton economic plan is not an end to gridlock. It is not action. It is a formula for economic disaster for the people of this country. We should reject this plan and cut the spending.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for 1-minute speeches has expired.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1578, EXPEDITED RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 642, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 149

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1578) to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours, with one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations. After general debate the bill shall be considered as read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 149 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 1578, the Expedited Rescissions Act of 1993. The resolution provides for 2 hours of general debate, 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations.

The resolution makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of the report accompanying the resolution.

No other amendment is in order except those printed in part 2 of the report, which shall be considered as read and considered only as follows: First, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by, and if offered by Representative CASTLE or Representative SOLOMON, or a designee, debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and second, an amendment to the Castle-Solomon amendment by, and if offered by Representative MICHEL or a designee, debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The amendments are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. The resolution waives all points of order against the amendments, and provides that any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment to the bill or the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text.

A waiver of clause 7 of rule 16—germaneness—is provided to the Michel amendment to the Castle-Solomon substitute printed in the report accompanying this resolution. This waiver is solely provided to the Michel amendment as it pertains to the Castle-Solomon substituted.

Finally, the resolution provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, in the publication entitled "A Vision of Change for America," the President outlines a plan to restore the American dream for us and our children.

The President's plan represents a drastic change from the status quo. The President wants to reject the policies and practices of the past which have quadrupled our debt and left many Americans believing their Government doesn't work. The people want change, and the President's program offers change for the betterment of our Nation.

The legislation made in order by this rule would give the President one of the key changes he has sought, and which I believe we desperately need: a modified line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, we all know wasteful spending sometimes occurs because individual items escape scrutiny by being submerged in large appropriations bills.

Under current procedures a President cannot strike out individual items in appropriations acts. He must sign or veto the whole act, whatever the consequences. H.R. 1578 would give the President an option he does not now have.

Under H.R. 1578, within 3 days of signing an appropriations act the President could send the House a message and bill proposing to rescind, or cancel, individual spending items in that act.

The President's proposal would be referred to the Appropriations Committee. That committee must report it to the floor without amendment within 7 days. The House must vote, up or down, on the President's bill within 10 days of introduction. During this time the funds would not be spent. If the bill passed the House, it would go to the Senate for expedited consideration there, and if passed by the Senate, on to the President for his signature.

To avoid the possibility a President might use this procedure not primarily to reduce the deficit, but instead to promote his own pet projects, H.R. 1578 would allow the House Appropriations Committee to report to the House, simultaneously with the President's bill, an alternative. To qualify for expedited consideration, the committee's bill must propose to cancel spending from the same appropriations act the President drew his rescissions from, and it must propose to cancel an amount of spending equal to or exceeding the President's total.

If the committee reported an alternative, the House would first vote on the President's bill; if adopted by a majority vote, the President's bill would go to the Senate for expedited consideration and the alternative would not be in order. If the House rejected the President's bill and passed the alternative, that bill would go to the Senate instead.

The Senate Appropriations Committee could also report an alternative bill. But it would not be in order to consider anything but the President's bill until the Senate first voted on and rejected the President's bill. The President is thus guaranteed a vote on his proposal.

If both Houses ultimately passed an alternative bill instead, then those funds would be canceled. Thus, under H.R. 1578, if either the President's bill or an alternative bill passed both Houses, spending will be cut and the American taxpayer would be the big winner.

Mr. Speaker, the President supports H.R. 1578 because he believes with a modified line-item veto like this in place millions and perhaps billions of

dollars might be saved. These our dollars which our taxpayers worked and earned by the sweat of their brows and sent to Washington to fund the essential activities of Government, not to be squandered on ridiculous pork-barrel projects.

This bill gives the President the tool he needs to block pork-barrel projects like asparagus research, renovating Lawrence Welk's birthplace, or studying the well-being of middle-class lawyers or the aggressive tendencies of fish in Nicaragua. It will let the President force Congress on the record regarding researching cockroaches, or why people fall in love, or building schools for North Africans in France.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of pork are an embarrassment which we can clearly not afford. The American people won't stand for them, and we don't have any business asking them to do so.

Quite simply, H.R. 1578 will create accountability. No longer will a President be able to sign an appropriations act containing wasteful items and claim he was powerless to block them.

No longer will Congress be able to force upon the President the dilemma of vetoing an entire act and shutting down the Government, or signing the whole thing, bacon and all. If Congress wants to appropriate funds for these purposes, then a majority of either House need only stand up and be counted. If the President does not want them, then he has the responsibility to send them back. It is that simple, and I believe it will work.

Mr. Speaker, last year I held extensive hearings in my subcommittee on various legislative line-item veto proposals, and brought the forerunner of H.R. 1578 to the floor, where it passed by a vote of 312 to 97. The bill before us today is, in my opinion, a better bill than last year's. It deserves our strong support.

The rule also deserves our strong support. It makes in order a Republican substitute, an amendment thereto offered by the minority leader or his designee, and it does not restrict the motion to recommit. Many issues have already been worked out; the rule will allow a full airing of the remainder. I urge all Members to support the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, for yielding us half of his time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the next 5 hours that we are going to be able to enlighten the American people on the need for a true line item veto and the problems that led up to the need for it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us which makes in order this expedited rescission bill, is the tenth consecutive modified closed or closed rule reported in this Congress. Not one rule has been open unfortunately.

Over the last 3 months, we on the minority side have been trying to impress upon our Democrat colleagues and on the American people back home as well that when we complain about closed rules we are not simply engaging in some kind of procedural or partisan tantrum. We are instead trying to warn against what we perceive as the deliberate decline of democracy in this House.

Now I will readily admit that to the average American a closed rule probably does not mean anything, but, if we ask that same citizen taxpayer how he or she would feel if they knew that their elected Representative was not allowed to fully participate in the legislative process in the House of Representatives, the anger would begin to rise, and it is beginning to rise, my colleagues. I suspect that their first reaction would be, "Why are we paying them those big salaries if they can't even offer amendments to legislation on behalf of me, our town, our State and our country?"

□ 1220

Why do we call them lawmakers if they do not have any real voice in making laws? And that is what is happening on this floor, ladies and gentlemen.

So all of a sudden the term "closed rule" has some real meaning for the people back home, when they realize that individual people sitting here to represent them cannot even offer amendments on the floor of this House. They begin to realize that their Representative really has no say about what goes on here in Washington. Boy, I would be ashamed if that were me.

Today we have a modified closed rule that allows for just two amendments. And, while one of those two amendments has my name on it along with a group of our freshman Republicans, and is a true line-item veto, I just cannot support this rule.

Instead, I offered in the Rules Committee a substitute open rule that would have specifically allowed our Republican leader to amend the so-called Spratt bill by including tax provisions under the President's expedited rescission authority.

It would also have allowed the freshman Democrats to offer a substitute extending that authority to all tax expenditures and make this rescission authority permanent. Not just 2 years, but permanent, no matter who the President is. That amendment was presented to the Rules Committee on the debt limit bill by Representatives MINGE, DEAL, and INSLEE as an alternative to the Stenholm-Spratt approach.

In other words, they were attempting to put some teeth in this toothless tiger. I was excited and I commended them for being up there testifying before our Committee on Rules. But they were denied the right by their own Democrat Party to offer that amendment, because the Democrats killed my request for an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way the House used to operate, full and open debate on amendments and deliberation, and we used to produce good legislation. The American people at that time held us in such esteem that about 85 percent of the American people approved of what we were doing here. Now look at the esteem they hold us in. Sometimes it is embarrassing to go home.

Nowadays, however, we are being asked to confine ourselves to partisan boxes. You can have your one partisan amendment, we will have our one partisan alternative, and heaven forbid if any other Member of this House should have an independent idea.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is unreasonable on something as important as the issue of the expedited rescission versus the true line-item veto to have an open amendment process. I do not think it is unreasonable to have a process whereby we try to reach a consensus approach that takes the best from both parties and from all Members regardless of political party. Really, that is what representative government is.

And yet, we are told that this rule and the bill it makes in order was in truth brought to this floor as a tradeoff to gain votes for the debt limit bill yesterday.

The truth in that is evident when you consider that the main amendment made in order by this rule as the base bill was not even before the Rules Committee when we took testimony yesterday. It was not the subject of hearings in the Government Operations Committee earlier this year, and I see the ranking Republican sitting over there, or in the Rules Committee late last year that I am the ranking Republican on.

No, this amendment, which showed up on the Rules Committee's doorstep late in the day yesterday, like an abandoned baby of unknown parentage, was suddenly embraced by the majority as a long lost son, though it bears little resemblance to any of the family members that were paraded before our committee earlier in the day.

I am not exactly sure what that makes this new bill, though I am told this bird of a different feather strongly resembles a cardinal. You know what a cardinal is. It has a red hat.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell on the substance of this new bill, in part because no one testified on its behalf to describe it for us, so I don't think there is anybody here that can explain it today.

Even the chairman of the Rules Committee admitted to me during debate yesterday that he doubted there was

any knowledgeable authority who could explain this to our satisfaction or understanding. Yet it is in the base text of this bill.

Ironically, this new bird which was reportedly hatched in a cardinal's nest, and for those people who might be listening, you know cardinals are referred to in this House as appropriators, they set up a system which could ultimately lead to violating the rules and precedents of this House which recognize the supremacy of who, the College of Cardinals, the House Committee on Appropriations.

The reason is that under the House rules all appropriation bills must originate in the House. You all know that. You have read the Constitution. Like appropriation bills, rescission bills which strike previously appropriated funds originate under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Appropriations.

That is not only how we have operated historically, but that is what the Constitution says.

While this bill initially recognizes that any Presidential rescission bill must originate in the House of Representatives, all that changes if the House passes the President's rescission bill and the Senate does not.

You folks had better go back and think about that, especially you appropriators. You have bitten off more than you can chew.

When that happens, it is in order for the Senate to originate an alternative rescission bill. That means that the Senate bill could be "blue slipped" back to the Senate without a vote because it violates the constitutional prerogatives of this House.

In short, we would be left with no rescission bill at all. The President's rescission bill would be dead. The Senate rescission bill could well be in violation of the Constitution.

And the only real winners would be those who have a voracious appetite for pork. That's spelled o-i-n-k, and is pronounced: "Oink, oink, oink."

Do I make myself perfectly clear?

This new bill, in short, is a gotcha bill. And the reality of this rule is that you now have a choice between a real line-item veto preferred by our side, and by many Members of your side of the aisle as well, and I see some of them sitting over there, and I applaud them for it, and the fiscal equivalent of what I call hog steroids on your side. In clearer terms, that means hog wash.

Mr. Speaker, I tend to doubt that House appropriators seriously intend to give away this important constitutional prerogative, but that is exactly what this bill does. This bill really ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary and let them study that ramification.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore urge my colleagues to vote down this rule. I am one of the Members that came here 15 years ago fighting for a line item veto and am still here 15 years later doing the same thing. I would urge Members to vote down this rule and put pressure on your Democratic leadership and Democratic Committee on Rules to bring us an open rule that will allow us to reach a bipartisan consensus approach to a meaningful line item veto bill that is in the best interests of the American people, 80 percent of whom favor not this bill, but a true line item veto bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members to please vote no on the rule and let us go back upstairs and let all factions in both political parties be represented here on the floor. That is what America is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the record the rollcall votes taken in the Committee on Rules last night on this rule, some updated data on open versus restrictive rules, and a copy of the open rule we offered in the Committee on Rules last night.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT RULE ON H.R. 1578, SPRATT EXPEDITED RESCISSION BILL

1. Open Rule.—Two-hours of general debate (divided equally between Rules & Govt. Ops.); Castle-Solomon amendment in the nature of a substitute, subject to amendment by Michel targeted tax provision amendment; and, if Castle-Solomon is rejected, Michel amendment would be in order to bill, followed by consideration of the Minge substitute for Spratt. All amendments would be subject to debate under the five-minute rule under the normal amendment process meaning other amendments could be offered when amendment tree allows. Points of order would be waived against amendments. Rejected: 3–7. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter.

2. Michel Amendment to Spratt.—Adding rescission authority for targeted tax provisions to Stenholm's expedited rescission approach (30-minutes of debate, appropriate waivers). Rejected: 3–8. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter.

3. Minge-Deal-Inslee Substitute Amendment.—Modified line-item veto—permanent authority to rescind budget authority and tax expenditures, subject to majority approval by both Houses (one-hour of debate; appropriate waivers). Rejected: 3–8. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter.

4. Clinger Amendment.—To Spratt bill, removes two-year sunset provision. Rejected: 3–8. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter.

5. Duncan Substitute.—Identical to Castle-Solomon except it amends the Budget Act and makes the veto permanent (i.e., no two-year sunset provision). Rejected: 3–8. Yeas: Solomon, Dreier and Goss. Nays: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter.

6. Motion to Report Rule.—A modified closed rule making in order just two amendments. Adopted: 8–3. Yeas: Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon and Slaughter. Nays: Solomon, Dreier and Goss.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—103D CONGRESS

Rule number and date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58—Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176; A: 259–164 (2/3/93)
H. Res. 59—Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171; A: 249–170 (2/4/93)
H. Res. 103—Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172; A: 237–178 (2/24/93)
H. Res. 106—Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166; A: 249–163 (3/3/93)
H. Res. 119—Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170; A: 248–170 (3/10/93)
H. Res. 132—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental approps.	37 (D–8; R–29)	1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185 (3/18/93)
H. Res. 133—Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget Resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172; A: 251–172 (3/18/93)
H. Res. 138—Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164; A: 247–169 (3/24/93)
H. Res. 147—Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	
H. Res. 149—Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993.	5 (D–1; R–4)	3 (D–1; R–2)	

Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ-Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

H.R. 1578—PROVIDING AN OPEN RULE FOR THE EXPEDITED RESCISSION BILL

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1578) to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by the Congress of certain proposals by the President to rescind amounts of budget authority, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution, and which shall not exceed two hours, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, and one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall first be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution by, and if offered by Representative Castle of Delaware or Representative Solomon of New York, or a designee, said amendment shall be considered as read, and all points of order

against said amendment are hereby waived. It shall first be in order to consider an amendment to said amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules by, and if offered by, Representative Michel of Illinois, or a designee, and, if said amendment in the nature of a substitute is not agreed to, it shall immediately be in order to consider the second amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution by Representative Michel to the bill; both of said amendments by Representative Michel shall be considered as read, and all points of order against said amendments are hereby waived. It shall also be in order, if the amendment in the nature of a substitute previously referred to is not adopted, to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution, by and if offered by Representative Minge of Minnesota, or a designee, said amendment shall be considered as read, and all points of order against said amendment are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.".

EXPLANATION

This amendment to the proposed rule provides for a two-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 1578, the "Expedited Consideration of Proposed Rescissions Act of 1993." The rule first makes in order a Castle-Solomon line-veto amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would first be subject to a Michel amendment on targeted tax provisions. If the amendment in the nature of a substitute is rejected, a similar Michel amendment would first be in order to the introduced bill; and, it would then be in order to consider the Minge amendment in the nature of a substitute. The above amendments and other amendments would be considered under an open amendment process under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speak, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] being the constitutional scholar that he is, must understand and know that the Constitution says nothing about appropriation bills. It says revenue bills.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, and I oppose the bill. When I hear people talk about the Constitution of the United States and Congress, I want to vomit. We are about as far away from the Constitution as we can get.

For all the new Members, check this out. In 1985 Congress passed a law that not only stripped the power from the people, but gave the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, the power to raise taxes and cut spending.

□ 1230

The Supreme Court had to strike it down.

I oppose the bill for one reason. I do not care if the President is Democrat or Republican. I am not for stripping the powers of the people any further and increasing, expanding the powers of the Chief Executive and the courts.

The people are to draft all laws, regulate commerce with foreign nations, raise taxes, pass budgets.

The President has the constitutional power to veto. Nowhere in the Constitution does the President have the power to micromanage the people's laws and budgets.

I oppose this wimp Congress action that is so afraid of the debt they try to delegate it to the guy from OMB so that when the fecal matter hits the fan, they could say, "It wasn't me. It was the guy behind the tree from OMB."

The sheriff does not buy it. I want to say this to the Congress, and I want to caution the Congress, there has never been a nation of free people overthrown by a duly elected representative of the people. Let me say, for every action there is an equal, an opposite reaction.

When we take away the power of the people, we send it somewhere. And it goes to that Chief Executive or to those courts. And the people in America are so upset with their government, they are taking it out on themselves. And we are allowing it.

I am going to vote for the rule. The people want the Democrats to govern. The Democrats bring the rule. But I am not going to rubber stamp any bills that would weaken the power of the people. And I think what I should be saying should not be falling on deaf ears.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and would like to say this: We keep talking about the Constitution. We ought to look at regulating commerce with foreign nations. And if we are going to balance the budget, we will not do it by giving a President a little red ink pen. We will do it by straightening out our balance of trade and putting Americans back to work.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Government Operations where this bill should have originated.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It is more than a little disappointing that the very first bill to be brought to the floor from the Government Operations Committee during the 103d Congress, the very first bill that I will be managing as the ranking Republican of the committee, was never voted on by the committee, never debated by the committee, never subjected to normal and appropriate committee procedures. That is not the way to do business and I don't intend to begin my tenure as the committee's ranking member by supporting such a travesty.

Yesterday, I testified before the Rules Committee expressing my concerns with this distortion of the committee process. Although the Government Operations Committee conducted one legislative hearing this year on the general issue of enhanced rescission authority, no regular mark up was held and no opportunity was given to Members on either side of the aisle to offer amendments, although several of the minority members including myself had an interest in offering amendments.

It is too easy for the majority party, with a Democrat in the White House and control of both Houses of Congress, to abuse the House rules and minority rights by bypassing the normal committee procedures and then allowing few amendments to be considered on the floor. This practice effectively cuts off any opportunity for members from either side of the aisle to participate in the legislative process. It should be in the interest of all House Members that legislation like this be fully considered by the appropriate committees before it reaches consideration on the House floor.

Because it was not, and because we have not been given the opportunity to fully offer amendments, I urge the rejection of this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

In the campaign, there was no issue that inspired more discussion among my constituents than the subject of the line-item veto. Both pro and con, debates over whether the President should have the additional power or whether he should not have the additional power.

Mr. Speaker, in just 3 months here, I am more convinced that ever that this is a necessary step. In these days of $1.5 trillion budgets and a far-reaching national government, it is simply not good enough to say that 200-plus years ago the Founding Fathers did not envision this particular distribution of responsibility between the executive and the legislative branch.

It is time for us to bring our procedures into line with the realities of today's government. With a line-item veto, the President will be able to pull out from the avalanche of Federal spending those items that he thinks are inappropriate for the use of taxpayer dollars, and he will be able to force the Congress to come out once again in the light of day, under the glare of the spotlight and decide, separate out from all of the avalanche of Federal spending whether we believe

that that particular item is worthy of being sent on taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is on the subject of the rule. Quite frankly, no one has been as outspoken as I have about the need for openness in debate. But I support this rule today for two reasons.

The first is that it fairly frames the question for debate. On an issue as controversial as the line-item veto, that is the responsibility of the Committee on Rules.

For those who want to vote for a modified line-item veto, enhanced rescission, we have that opportunity today. For those who want to vote for the full line-item veto of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], we will have that opportunity as well.

But most importantly, on a subject as controversial as this, there will never be a procedure that will make everybody happy.

The bottom line is this, and the American people and everyone who supports a line-item veto ought to know it of whatever version, and that is that a vote for this rule brings to the floor of the House of Representatives the line-item veto which so many members of the American public want. And a vote against this rule is a vote against this House of Representatives considering a line-item veto.

I urge support of the rule for supporters of the line-item veto on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], chairman of the task force known as "Porkbusters." He has been one of the real outstanding Members who have tried to get a handle on spending in this Congress.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

It is time to give the President of the United States a greater part to play in the appropriations process which is tilted too much in Congress' favor.

For years Congress has been a profligate overspender. It has not balanced a budget for more than 23 years in a row. It has run up more than $4.1 trillion of debt. It now incurs $300 billion per year in interest on that debt. That debt amounts to about $16,000 per every man, woman, and child in America and equals about 51 percent of our Nation's GDP. Based on what I have witnessed with all the new taxing and spending now going on, our national debt will grow by the trillions over the next 5 years of the budget resolution we just passed.

So, is it not time that Congress gave some increased power to the executive branch in determining spending? We always like to blame Presidents for our overspending. But we know who the spendthrifts are. We should know by now that Congress is in serious need of help in determining spending priorities.

We have a chance today to vote for either the Solomon or the Stenholm rescission plans. Frankly, I would prefer that we inculcate a Presidential rescission plan in the Constitution. Mr. SOLOMON would agree. That way we would have a real line-item veto and Congress could not think up ways in which to wiggle out of spending cuts by passing new laws or waiving rules, something we are very good at doing. Of what we have before us, though, I think the Solomon bill is the better of the two. I say that because the Solomon bill grants direct power to the President to propose a rescission which goes into effect unless the Congress can pass a rescission disapproval bill in 20 days. The rescission disapproval bill can be, of course, vetoed by the President, and Congress then won't be able to reverse the President's rescissions without a two-thirds vote.

Now that is raw meat. Many Members worry about a President misusing such a statutory line-item veto power. But that's akin to a drunken sailor refusing help. We prefer to keep our profligacys to ourselves while still retaining the right to blame Presidents for our overspending.

My good friend, Congressman STENHOLM also has a rescission plan which amends the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. It has good points but one major flaw. It is the same flaw which has made a wet noodle of our existing Presidential rescission power. I refer to the fact that the Stenholm bill, by amending the Budget Act of 1974, would have its provisions enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and Senate. Thus, all of its noble and not so noble provisions can be waived, repealed, ignored, and trampled upon in the same manner in which we view the rules of this House so often being waived, repealed, ignored, and trampled upon whenever the majority wills it.

I suppose it will be the Stenholm bill which will survive, to a great extent because of the respect we have for Mr. STENHOLM, but mostly because the Rules Committee and the majority leadership can make mishmash out of it whenever it suits them.

On the other hand, I frankly do not believe the Stenholm bill will ever survive the rigors of Byrd-land, wet-noodle or not, for one can at least bet that if its provisions are monkeyed with—as they will be—they will have Congressman STENHOLM to deal with. And by passing the House, it will enable a lot of us to say we voted for a line-item veto even though it is not a line-item veto. It is, after all, important to be perceived as being for a line-item veto even if one is not.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

TAKE IT FROM ONE WHO'S TRIED: "EXPEDITED RESCISSION" PROPOSALS THAT REQUIRE APPROVAL OF CONGRESS DO NOT, AND WILL NOT, WORK

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to urge my colleagues to support Rep. Solomon's substitute, when the House takes up "enhanced rescission" legislation. Take it from someone who tried to use the existing rescission authority: The Stenholm/Spratt proposal will not work because it has the same basic flaw that plagues the current law: it is subject to the rules of the House. In fact, Stenholm/Spratt provides that its provisions are enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and Senate which means of course that it could be changed at the whim of the Majority.

Rep. Solomon's approach, H.R. 24, is a statutory line-item veto and can work.

This is a very complicated issue, but please bear with me; those who support giving the President line-item veto authority should understand the critical distinction between the Solomon and Stenholm/Spratt approaches.

CURRENT LAW

We already have "expedited Presidential rescission authority" on the books; it is section 1017 of the Budget Act of 1974. This provision allows the President to send rescission messages to Congress. Congress, in response, must approve the President's rescissions, or the money will be obligated. There are expedited procedures in the law that allow just one-fifth of the members of the House to bring rescissions to a vote under this "approval authority."

Last year was the first time since I have been in Congress that a President tested the 1974 "expedited rescission authority". Republicans in the House invoked section 1017 last April to get a vote, as provided under the law, on 96 Presidential rescission messages. We easily had the requisite one-fifth of the House. However, we soon discovered why "expedited approval authority" doesn't work under the Budget Act of 1974.

All of the expedited procedures for bringing rescissions to a vote are part of the Budget Act. Sec. 1017 of the Budget Act is a "rulemaking statute," i.e., it was enacted "as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and Senate" and, like other rules of the House, it may be waived or changed if a majority of the Members vote to do so. Accordingly, all of these wonderful expedited procedures can be waived or altered by a simple majority of House members in a rule or otherwise. This is precisely what the Rules Committee did to us last year—they waived our right to get a vote on the Presidential rescissions, even though the Budget Act gave us that right, and the President's rescissions died without any vote as required by the law.

THE STENHOLM/SPRATT RESCISSION BILL

The Stenholm/Spratt Rescission bill inherits this same fatal flaw. It also requires the approval of the President's suggested rescissions by Congress by the passage of the "draft bill" submitted by the President with his rescission message. As an amendment to the 1974 Budget Act it requires that Congress consider rescissions within a specified time period, and requires a "a vote on final passage of the bill shall be taken in the House. However, all of these provisions, under new sec. 1013, are also enacted "as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and Senate" and could be waived or altered by a simple majority vote.

THE SOLOMON ALTERNATIVE IS A STATUTORY LINE-ITEM VETO

The Solomon line-item veto proposal, a proposed substitute to Stenholm/Spratt, is a statutory line-item veto proposal for FYs 94. It is completely outside of the Budget Act of 1974 and, therefore, is not subject to, or deemed to be, a part of the rules of the House. It rescinds budget authority so designated by the president, unless a rescission disapproval bill making available all of the amount rescinded by the President is enacted into law by Congress.

The Solomon plan does not give Congress any way to squirm out of voting on the rescissions if they want to spend the money. The President rescinds designated appropriations. The rescissions will never be spent unless Congress passes, and the President signs, a rescission disapproval bill. The President would, most likely, veto the rescission disapproval, but Congress could override the veto with a two-thirds majority. The Congressional Research Service experts tell me that the Solomon approach is clearly constitutional.

Believe me, there is no way to make an "approval" type procedure work by amending the 1974 Budget Act and subjecting such an "enhanced rescission" power to the rules of the House. As long as Congress can avoid taking a vote on the rescissions, and they can always find a way under their "Rules", there is no Constitutional way to ever guarantee a vote on the Presidential rescissions.

Sincerely,

HARRIS W. FAWELL,
Member of Congress.

□ 1240

Mr. SOLOMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he would mind asking unanimous consent to submit for the record his "Dear Colleague" letter, which explains the real difference between the two bills.

Mr. FAWELL. I will say to the gentleman, I am glad to do so, if that is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has 16½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 90 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK].

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, this House has already completed action on a budget resolution which will trim nearly $496 billion from our Federal deficit over the next 5 years. Today, we have the opportunity to enact a structural reform which will restore common sense to the budget process.

As one who served as a cabinet secretary in the executive branch of California's government, I know first hand the value of a line-item veto. There are times when executives must have the power to make painful, responsible spending cuts. In fact, 43 Governors today have some form of line-item veto at their disposal.

The new Members of this body, myself included, have seen how difficult it is to make hard choices and necessary spending cuts. The legislation we must pass today will enable the President to take the steps necessary to bring fiscal discipline to our Nation.

I will gladly support expedited rescission authority for the President. I urge my colleagues to cast aside partisanship and vote for this rule which will bring this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. HUNTER], a very valuable Member.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my colleague, my good friend [Ms. SCHENK], who is from San Diego also, and all other Members who spoke about this rule bringing forth the opportunity to vote on a line-item veto within the next several hours.

It is true that we will have a chance to vote for the line-item veto, but the Democrat proposal is not a line-item veto. Let us make this very clear.

I think we all remember in the movie Crocodile Dundee when Mr. Dundee was accosted by a gentleman who had a very short knife, and he pulled it out, and Crocodile Dundee said, "That is not a knife, this is a knife," and he pulled out a real knife, a big knife.

Let me tell the Members, Solomon-Castle is a real knife. The Democrat proposal is not like the line-item veto of California. Interestingly, it is not like the line-item veto of any one of the 43 States of the Union that have a real line-item veto. In short, it is not a line-item veto.

A majority of either body can kill this line-item veto attempt by the President of the United States, a majority of either body. In the real line-item veto, that is, Castle-Solomon, it takes a two-thirds majority, a two-thirds majority in both Houses to kill the line-item veto attempt by the President.

In other words, Castle-Solomon allows the President to make real cuts. Our constituents want us to make real cuts, and they want this cutting in the public debt, which they are so concerned about, to be a partnership between the President and the Congress. Once again, the line-item veto instrument that the Democrats are offering is not a real line-item veto, and we will show in the full debate what is a line-item veto for every one of the 43 States in the Union that uses a real line-item veto, including California.

This is not like any of them. This is very watered down, and once more, it is an attempt by the Democrat majority to take a Republican issue, suck all the substance out of it, and leave the hollow shell, and tell the American people, "We have done something for you." This does nothing for the debt-cutting process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to say that I support this rule. I have been one who has believed that more rules need to be opened up. There needs to be more genuine debate on the issues. I think this amendment reflects a good balance in terms of opening up the process and getting full debate. I compliment the Committee on Rules.

This bill establishes a new process for considering presidentially suggested cuts to spending bills. Under current law, the President may submit cuts to Congress as part of the appropriations process, but we are not required to vote on the cuts. The spending will automatically go into effect unless we do.

Under this bill, which is a profound change in law, the Congress must vote on the cuts within 10 days. The bill is for a 2-year period only, while we see if the process works.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SCHENK] and other freshman Democrats who have taken great leadership on this have said, our constituents are most desirous of efforts to reduce nonauthorized and earmarked spending, sometimes referred to as pork barrel, sometimes erroneously, but that is the kind of spending that folks want us to address.

This bill is a genuine effort to focus on making our spending decisions more prudent. I disagree with the Speaker. I think this is a profound change in the way we have done business here.

There are some problems in this bill. Not all spending is covered. Only discretionary spending is covered, so entitlement programs are not affected. Tax expenditures are not covered, although that may be corrected as an amendment to this bill. I think that they should be.

I also know there are some very serious institutional reservations, particularly from some of the appropriators, but other people as well, that this takes away powers from Congress. However, it is a first start to address the public need to see us dealing effectively with the spending issue.

There is an expression that "the perfect is the enemy of the good." This bill may not be perfect, but it is good. It is good enough that we should pass it today and let the American people know that we are serious about making prudent spending decisions in the future.

Mr. SOLOMON. As the Chair can see, we have a had whole host of freshman

Republican speakers. We have another one right now. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Midland City, AL, Mr. TERRY EVERETT, a freshman and a really outstanding Member.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and call on all freshman Members to put aside partisanship and vote against this rule, for the sake of the American people.

I came to this great body, like many of my freshman Democratic friends, largely because the people in my district wanted change.

□ 1250

Part of the change they wanted was a true, a true line-item veto.

Well, I have heard a lot about change, but I have not seen any real change, none at all. Frankly, I have been disappointed that with 110 new Members who have promised the people back home that they would work for that change, that this Congress has not responded. What we have had is the same old nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late. We freshmen still have an opportunity to reach across party lines and do something for the American people.

I say to my friends across the aisle, help us vote this rule down. Help us vote this rule down, and as a Republican freshman I will vote to make in order the Democratic freshman true line-item veto.

I prefer the stronger Castle-Solomon true line-item veto, but for the sake of the American people I will vote to make in order the freshman true line-item veto, and to do what the public sent us here to do, make a change and change this place.

So I ask Members to vote no on this rule. It does not represent a true line-item veto, and it does not represent change.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule. This rule would allow for 2 hours of general debate as well as consideration of two of the leading alternative approaches to line-item veto.

I am surprised, and quite frankly disappointed that my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] opposes this rule today, because we are truly going to have a debate on the main issue of line-item veto, something that he has wanted and I have wanted. But now we find that he opposes the rule.

My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and I have added to the original legislation which I introduced several perfecting amendments on our amendment.

I consistently argue for rules which allow open debate on issues and an opportunity for the House of Representatives to honestly work its will. There have been a number of times, in fact once very recently, when I have been disappointed that the rules have not allowed a full airing of legislation, of opinions and an opportunity to cast votes on leading alternative approaches. Therefore, I appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday and asked that they make all germane amendments requested in order, and they did.

Today we are going to debate the issue of line-item veto, and those who want line-item veto will have an opportunity to vote on that issue today.

The issue of line-item veto authority has been debated for many years, and I have always opposed a straight line-item veto based on my belief that it creates an imbalance in the balance of powers between the legislative and the executive branches. I have found very appealing enhanced rescission authority, which is what we bring today in the Spratt-Stenholm amendment.

I believe that two issues, and there are other issues are now getting mixed up. The contract authority I think has appeal. I think the taxing issue has appeal. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be able to offer his amendment to this issue today, and we can debate it. I believe that these issues belong in the debate, and that is what we will do today.

My visceral reaction is that these issues should be included in rescission order. But I have not yet explored, nor have most of our colleagues on either side explored the pros and cons of adding these issues today. I am eager to hear others with greater constitutional and institutional expertise than I debate the nuances of including tax expenditures and contract authority in rescission authority. I think it is highly likely that 2 years from now when we consider renewing this contract on this legislation that I will be prepared to vote for rescissions of this sort.

At this point, however, I do not believe the debate has matured to the point where we should be attaching these unexplored ideas to legislation which is likely to be signed into law. many were rightfully concerned about minimal committee debate about this issue before it comes up today. Therefore, when we look at the issue before us at this very moment, the rule, how can anyone say that it is not a fair and open rule when we get to debate the issue that is before us today, and that is line-item veto as proposed by the other side and the modified rescission order as proposed by those of us who have believed that that is the proper way to go?

Vote for the rule. Let us get on with the debate, and let the majority rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in an act of fairness, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], one of the fairest speakers who takes the rostrum once in a while. I will pay him back a favor in this manner.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I rise today on behalf of the men and women of the Congressional Black Caucus who have taken a position of principle with regard to the matter of this rule and the rescission bill.

The Constitution clearly lays out implied and stated powers, and history has shown that every time a power is ceded, it is very seldom returned, and that the executive branch, whether Democrat or Republican, historically has taken unto itself implied powers within the Constitution. The War Powers Act and a number of other things I could stand here and recite, but suffice it to say that even on the matter of constitutionality there is still a great deal of question as to whether the Founding Fathers of this Nation meant in fact for the executive branch to have that sort of power.

So the Congressional Black Caucus, on a pure position of principle, stands in opposition to this rule, and in opposition to the rescissions act, and would urge Members of this body to join with others in an effort to defeat it.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today is a better day than yesterday. Last night's debate was an exercise in partisanship, but today we have an opportunity to move beyond that.

Last night a number of people on the minority side wanted to link two votes together, but here 12 hours later there is this rule which will finally give us our chance to vote and debate for the line-item veto.

I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize that none of these proposals before us nor this rule is perfect. There are many valid arguments over particular details in the program. But nobody always gets what they want. The rule may not be what certain Republicans want, but then we Democrats have a leadership that had us vote on debt ceiling during prime time, and have this debate and vote when none of my constituents are watching.

This rule allows us today to make today better than yesterday was. It allows us to establish the tools to make a better future.

This is an issue that cuts across party lines, as we have just seen from the previous speaker, but this is a rule that allows it to get to the floor. Let us bring it to the floor.

Last night each side just pointed fingers. Today we can do better. We can point the way to a better future.

Vote yes on the rule, and then let us debate and vote on the exact form of line-item veto on the merits.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great Georgia, Mr. JOHN LINDER, another outstanding freshman.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is an aphorism that goes, "Never attempt to teach a pig to sing. You will waste your time and annoy the pig."

Trying to sell this to the American people as a line-item veto is very much like trying to teach a pig to sing. It is not. It merely speeds the process up from 45 days to 20 days and requires the body to vote by majority to overrule the President, the same majority that passed the spending to start with. And it disappears in 2 years.

That is why Members must have a closed rule, because this body and the Democratic leadership cannot afford a wide-open vote on a real line-item veto such as they have in 43 States, such as the Castle-Solomon bill, such as the Democratic freshmen's proposal is.

I do not know why they chose not to introduce it or ask that it be made in order in the Rules Committee. But the Democratic freshmen had a better offer than this one before us.

□ 1300

Under the freshman plan, a rescission can only be blocked if both Houses pass disapproval legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one single issue before us that requires us to cast aside partisan concerns and act, it is the problem of the ever-growing Federal deficit. The American people have made it very clear that they want us to act decisively and in unison on this matter.

Only by granting the President a true line-item veto will we be able to say that.

If you will help us defeat this rule, we will make in order the freshman Democrats' proposal, which is a real line-item veto.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As one of the first African-American Members elected from the State of Florida in 129 years, I was sent to Congress to represent my constituents on every issue which is brought before the U.S. House of Representatives, including those involving appropriations and the national budget.

Before being elected to the House, I was a member of the Florida State House for 10 years. During my tenure, I worked with Democratic and Republican Governors who had line-item veto authority. My experience was one in which Governors did not use their power to reduce spending but instead used the line-item veto for partisan purposes.

As a result, I believe that I have an experienced perspective on H.R. 1578, the Expedited Rescission Act which is before the House for consideration. My concern is that H.R. 1578 would shift too much power to the President and the executive branch and give the White House a new tool to press Members of Congress on other matters. For example, the White House could threaten to rescind funding for a project in a particular Member's district if the Member did not support the President on another vote of importance to the white House.

This is the House of Representatives, in other words the people's House. Let's not take power away from the people who sent us here.

As a result, I urge my House colleagues to vote against the rule for H.R. 1578, any amendments, and the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the deputy minority whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be very clear here about what is being voted on. This is not a vote on line-item veto. Any of you coming to the floor and thinking you are going to get cover for voting for a line-item veto here, you are not.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] himself, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said that he will oppose and he has always opposed the pure line-item veto. He says, "I do not believe giving any President one-third-plus-one veto authority on the works of Congress. I think it unbalances the balance of power."

So this is not anything close to a line-item veto. Even the chief sponsor of it says that.

This is another play on words that the Democrats have gotten good at. You know, they now call investments—that is their new word for Big Government spending; contributions are now their new word for Big Government taxes; and rescission is now the new word for pork protection.

What the Democrats really are offering probably should be called enhanced circumcision, because it effectively cuts the truly taxpayer friends out of the process, and this is just an absolutely terrible piece of legislation, if you really want to get to where the President is going to have real authority.

I do not think that you are going to get there with anything that the process today offers. If you really want to help us get to a true line-item veto, what you want to do is defeat this rule so that we can work to make in order the Democratic freshmen's package which is more likely a real line-item veto. That is the way to really get to the heart of the matter here.

I think that there is a good chance this rule may go down. If it goes down, what we ought to get back then is a true line-item veto rather than fooling around at the edges the way this particular package does.

This is simply an attempt to give people cover. We ought not have votes on the floor giving people cover. What we need to have is packages on the floor that do real things.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman answer one question? It is my understanding that the Committee on Rules made in order the Republican leadership's request to grant the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] what you wished to have debated on the floor, and it is my understanding that that is line-item veto. If it is not, why did you not, when you got the opportunity to debate on this floor line-item veto, offer it? But is it not true that your amendment is line-item veto, I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is.

Mr. STENHOLM. All right. So we will be debating line-item veto. And we will vote on your proposal up and down with the will of the House today. So why would the gentleman from Pennsylvania stand here and say we are giving cover? Everybody is going to get a chance to vote, and you are too, but you are complaining about it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 135]

Abercrombie	Barlow	Blackwell
Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Allard	Barrett (WI)	Blute
Andrews (ME)	Bartlett	Boehlert
Andrews (NJ)	Barton	Boehner
Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Bonilla
Applegate	Becerra	Bonior
Armey	Beilenson	Borski
Bacchus (FL)	Bentley	Boucher
Bachus (AL)	Bereuter	Brewster
Baesler	Berman	Browder
Baker (CA)	Bevill	Brown (FL)
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Bryant
Barcia	Bishop	Bunning

Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1412

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). On this rollcall, 405 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1578, EXPEDITED RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to proceed for the purpose of yielding to the distinguished majority leader to tell us where we are and where we may be going.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously, as the gentleman from South Carolina just said, the rule has been withdrawn. And it would be our intend to revisit this issue, the rule and the bill, at some time when we come back, soon after we come back.

Let me say to Members that we would like to go to a recess after this colloquy to have a few moments to try to make a better determination of what might be happening on the other side. At this moment we do not know what they may be able to accomplish in the next 24 hours. There may be the ability, at some point in the next 24 hours, for them to pass the investment stimulus bill, in which case there could be the ability then to go to conference, and to pass a debt ceiling, which may make it possible for us to go on the district work period.

There also may be a possibility that they could move a debt ceiling that we have already processed here without making a determination on the investment stimulus package, in which case, also, we could go forward with the district work period.

The other possibility is not as inviting for us, and that is that they can do neither and intend to come back on Monday or Wednesday and try again to deal with these matters.

I would apprise Members of the fact that it is our information at some time next week it may begin to cost the Treasury money if a debt ceiling is not finished that would not be expended if we were able to pass the debt ceiling. So we are very reluctant to go into the district work period without trying to bring that matter to a close so that the Treasury is not disinvesting funds and losing interest that would not be lost if we could pass the debt ceiling.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might inquire, if we recessed would we come back at a time certain for the day?

Mr. GEPHARDT. My suggestion is that we try to recess for one-half hour or 1 hour and take a better reading of whatever is happening in the other body. We consult then with you, and then we will come back and give Members the most definitive word that we can at that time.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And we would notify Members through the Cloakroom one-half hour before we come back, and we would try to come back within 1 hour.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the majority leader.

Might I just make an observation, that I think it is quite obvious that the votes were not there for the rule that was reported, and that happens from time to time, not many times. But what I would like to say is that it may suggest that we do have to give real serious consideration to making some adjustments on how our rules are reported, and the nature of those rules so that conceivably most every Member of this body can have an equal opportunity to have his say, like he was elected to do. And I think if we can move in that direction, then I think it is going to be better for all of us over the course of the remainder of this session, certainly, and I would hope that just may be a forerunner of what we could expect by way of accommodation on rules.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that our freshman Member RICHARD POMBO and his wife, Annette, have been a lot more productive this morning than the House of Representatives. They had a baby daughter born 9:30 this morning, Rena Murre Pombo, 7 pounds, 21 inches.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if I could inquire of the distinguished majority leader, upon our return from recess, would the gentleman anticipate that there would be votes, and if a 15-minute vote is called, would the leadership anticipate leaving the vote open for another half hour and 15 minutes for those of us who have been off on an errand to get back and make the vote?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, when we notify Members as to when we intend to come back, and again I say that should be in 1 hour, we will tell Members whether or not to expect further votes.

I do not expect that unless we have some imminent action on the other side that we would have any votes to report, and we would hope that if we then go into the end of our session, in special orders, that we would not have any votes for adjournment at the end of that period so Members could then be free to go.

Mr. MICHEL. And I might make the observation, the last we heard is that the cloture vote scheduled for the other body was not going to be until 5 o'clock, and really there is not much going to happen until you get over that hurdle.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to inquire of the majority leader, could we have a definite time, because last night, you know, it went on for hours before we knew where we were. And it would be for the convenience of all of the Members, both Democrat and Republican, if we could come back at say 3:15 and have some kind of a definite explanation of where we are.

□ 1420

Mr. GEPHARDT. Let me say to the gentleman that I am going to do everything in my power to have us back here at 3:30. The only reason that we would not be able to do that is if we cannot get the kind of information we would like to be able to give you about the end of this period. But we will aim at 3:30 to come back and to inform Members of where we are.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, the happy announcement was made on that side, and I would like to tell Members that a little earlier I talked to our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT], whose 3-year-old daughter underwent surgery for a tumor on her liver today in Boston, and she came through it very well and is doing great.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) laid before the House the following communication from the Republican leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 2, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 801(b)(8) of Public Law 100-696, I hereby appoint the following member of the House to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission for the 103rd Congress:

Representative Bill Young of Florida.

Sincerely yours,

BOB MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 69

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 69.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess. The Members will be advised of the next activity in the House. There will be a half-hour notice given to the Cloakroom, and a 15-minute bell will sound before the House convenes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1625

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY] at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I request this time that I might yield to the distinguished majority leader to bring us up to date on where we go from here.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch over the last hour or so with the leadership in the other body. I do not believe that I have any more, unfortunately, definitive information that I can give Members about what the other body is likely to be able to do. They will have a cloture vote at 5 and there will obviously be further negotiations on both of the matters that are still under consideration there. There may or may not be able to be action on those matters, either later tonight or tomorrow.

Given that state of uncertainty, we would propose the following schedule for the House and Members over the next days:

We would like to adjourn now, so Members will know that there will be no more votes today. We would like to go over until noon Monday, which may be a pro forma session. We would think it would be a pro forma session, unless some actions are taken in the other body that would require us to be here on Monday to process bills that they have produced or to bring up a recess resolution.

If there is the possibility of votes on Monday, we will inform Members of that fact on Sunday morning. We will try to give 24 hours notice to all Members of whether or not we think there could be a possibility of votes on Monday.

Then looking out beyond that, we would not propose to meet on Tuesday, because it is a Jewish holiday. If there is the necessity of an additional meeting, we would think that would be on Wednesday at 2 p.m., April 7. Obviously that session may or may not be needed. We are just uncertain at this point.

As the gentleman knows, until we pass a recess resolution we have to meet every 3 days while the other body is still in session. That is the reason for the pro forma session on Monday, unless that has to be changed to a session that might have votes, and that is why the next session on Wednesday might be necessary.

Mr. MICHEL. If that session on Monday would become a more meaningful session, other than just pro forma as a result of any kind of agreement that might be reached over the weekend, as the majority leader indicated, we would give the Members notice. From our point of view I suspect it is best through the Cloakroom phone system to simply check in any time Sunday, or even maybe sometime tomorrow, as to what the latest would be then for Monday's session.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. We will be following what happens in the other body tonight and all day tomorrow, and will give as much information to both Cloakrooms as we possibly can.

ADJUSTMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to

meet at 12 noon on Monday, April 5, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1993 TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 7, 1993.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 2, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, H-209, the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House, that my Committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges of the House.

Sincerely yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

APRIL 2, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, H-209, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Custodian of Records of my office has been served with two subpoenas issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI.

FRESHMAN DEMOCRATIC REFORM PACKAGE

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, this week the freshmen Democratic Members of this body adopted a comprehensive package of congressional reforms.

The most important parts of this package are initiatives on campaign finance and lobbying reform. Together they will insure that this institution is responsive to the people's interest, not the special interests. Campaign and lobbying reform will fundamentally change the way the Congress does its business. Taken alone, however, they are insufficient to fully regain the public's trust. That is why we also propose—

Setting up an independent office of compliance to assure congressional adherence with the letter of every law in the land;

Slashing legislative branch spending by 25 percent; and

A series of internal rules reforms to allow us to do a more effective and efficient job of legislating.

Mr. Speaker, we ran for Congress to be part of a great deliberative body that protects the rights of all people and represents diverse views, but also has the ability to respond fully and decisively to the call for change. The reform package introduced this week will help Congress live up to these ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this important document on reform.

FRESHMAN DEMOCRATIC REFORM PACKAGE, MARCH 31, 1993

When the Democratic Caucus met in early December to discuss Caucus and House Rules changes, several changes were recommended by the Caucus Committee on Organization, Study and Review; the Democratic Study Group; and many others. Widespread concerns about the image of Congress—concerns underscored by the problems of the 102nd Congress—let many Members to advocate systemic changes in structure and procedure.

Several new Caucus and House Rules changes relating to organization and procedures were adopted in December and January; many others were referred to the newly created Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Seeing the need for further reform, Freshman Democrats asked for the opportunity to prepare their own package of Rules changes. The Democratic leadership granted the Freshmen 90 days to prepare a proposal and promised it would receive consideration in a full hearing upon its completion.

We have taken this responsibility seriously and have thoroughly reviewed a wide range of issues. Our recommendations are ambitious and far-reaching. They also are politically feasible, achievable and sensitive to the Rules changes already adopted. In making these recommendations, we acknowledge and support the ongoing work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. These recommended changes reflect the combined wisdom of new Members (many of whom ran on a platform of government reform) and the realities of the House as we have observed them during the early days of the 103rd Congress. Finally, our recommendations address concerns that affect not only new Members of Congress, but all Members of Congress.

We are pleased that the Democratic Leadership provided us with this opportunity, and we look forward to their support in working toward adoption of this package. By adopting these recommendations, this new Congress can provide many of the changes needed by our institution and our nation.

We ask those who review this report, both from inside and outside the institution, to measure it by the same standards we applied in designing this package of reforms:

Do the proposals strengthen the faith of the American people in their government?

Do they make the institution more responsive to average Americans and less so to special interests?

Do they make the Congress a more effective policy making body and a more efficient tool to carry out the will of the people?

We believe this package, taken as a whole, will go a long way toward achieving these important goals.

The legislative branch of government has been the subject of criticism during the last several years. Given the level and intensity of this criticism, we believe it is important for us to restate some foundational principles that have guided our work on this reform package.

We believe the United States has the best form of government in the world; our democratic process is the envy of people everywhere. Congress has played an important role in the greatest democratic success story in political history, and this reform agenda is aimed at making the Congress strong, vibrant, self-confident and assertive. We reject so-called reform efforts that are little more than attacks on the institution. Our job is to strengthen not weaken, to build up not tear down, to empower not erode. We ran for Congress to be part of a great deliberative body that protects the rights of all people and represents diverse views, but also has the ability to respond fully and decisively to the call for change. This review and these recommendations are intended to help Congress live up to those ideals.

I. CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The essence of our reform proposal centers on the relationship between the American people and their representatives. In election campaigns and in the halls of Congress, special-interest money consistently undermines representative government. Well-financed special interests use their considerable clout to distort the message or drown out the voices of the people. These special interests spend millions to influence legislation, yet they often evade requirements to register as lobbyists or to report how they use their money to get their way. They pour endless dollars into an apparently insatiable campaign finance system that makes campaigns more and more a contest of fund-raising skills and less and less a battle of competing ideas.

Campaign finance reform and lobbying reform are two linchpins of genuine congressional reform. Both are needed urgently, and both must be considered immediately. We view our role as catalysts for the changes that are necessary in these areas. As agents of change, we will push for early consideration—and adoption—of this reform agenda.

Campaign finance reform is a necessary first step in restoring confidence in the Con-

gress. Voluntary overall spending limits are needed to cap runaway campaign costs. Alternative resources, in the form of such items as communications vouchers, are needed as incentives for candidates to agree to limits. We strongly endorse President Clinton's call to eliminate the tax deduction for lobbying expenses, and we recommend the use of the subsequent new tax revenues as a funding source for campaign finance reform. PACs need to be limited in overall contributions they can make to a campaign, and we need tough new guidelines on independent expenditures. Finally, a campaign finance reform initiative must include tight new restrictions on so-called soft money.

Summary of recommendations:

(A) House consideration of campaign finance reform legislation by September 30, 1993;

(B) overall voluntary spending limits on campaigns;

(C) incentives in the form of alternative resources for candidates who accept spending limits paid for by, among other means, the elimination of the tax deduction for lobbying expenses;

(D) place new restrictions on the use of soft money by barring parties from using such donations for federal elections;

(E) limit PAC contributions;

(F) tighten restrictions on independent expenditures.

II. LIMITING THE INFLUENCE OF WELL-FINANCED LOBBYISTS

Citizens are guaranteed the right to petition their government, and the rights of citizen lobbyists must never be impinged. Well-heeled financial interests, however, exert an undue influence on the democratic process and tough new restrictions are necessary.

In the interest of fairness and full disclosure, we strongly support legislation to close numerous registration loopholes. In addition to these new registration requirements, however, we also support efforts to force itemized disclosure of lobbying expenses.

Campaign finance reform and lobbying reform go hand-in-hand. By stemming the flow of soft money, limiting PAC contributions, strengthening lobbying registration requirements and adding comprehensive disclosure standards, the public can be assured that special-interest money finally is being controlled in a meaningful way. This comprehensive approach means that the explosive growth of special interest money will be strictly limited and the money that remains in the system will, for the first time, be fully reportable.

Summary of recommendations:

(A) strengthen lobbying disclosure and registration laws by closing registration loopholes, streamlining disclosure requirements, and providing uniform lobbying disclosure standards;

(B) require lobbyists to itemize expenses;

(C) eliminate tax deduction for lobbying expenses.

III. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS REFORM

Campaign finance and lobbying reform efforts are major initiatives that will fundamentally change the way the Congress does its business. But taken alone, they are insufficient to regain the public's trust. Fundamental changes were made following the much publicized scandals that rocked Congress last year. Closing the House Bank, changing oversight of the House Post Office, and establishing a new professional management system are all important reforms. We applaud the efforts of our more senior colleagues. Nevertheless, several other initiatives are needed.

Although Congress has begun the process of making sure it is subject to the laws it passes for the rest of America, the job is not finished. We believe Congress should be subject to all of the laws of the land and that an independent office of compliance must be established to assure adherence with the letter of the law. We realize that legitimate issues exist regarding the constitutionality of various enforcement ideas. Accordingly, we call upon the leadership of this body to immediately review the specific constitutional issues with respect to enforcement and bring a proposal to the full House as soon as possible.

Spurred on by President Clinton's program of deficit reduction, Congress has begun to cut government spending. In this age of unprecedented budget deficits, Congress must take extraordinary action to reduce its own spending, both as a contribution toward the total deficit-reduction program and also as a method of winning the confidence and support of the American people in this ambitious program of reinvigorating our economy.

Although many Freshman Democrats already have trimmed their budgets voluntarily, we recommend the reduction of legislative branch spending by 25 percent over five years. We believe this dramatic reduction can be accomplished by streamlining the structure of Congress, while preserving essential constituent services.

A handful of special rules and practices continue to reinforce the public's perception that Congress is an institution of privilege. We support efforts to restrict retiring Members' ability to purchase district office furniture; establish uniform standards and accounting methods for congressional travel; and limit federal funding for offices and staff of former House speakers.

This mix of congressional ethics reform initiatives gets at the heart of the public's mistrust of Congress. Reform is an ongoing process, and we will be vigilant in ensuring that no existing privilege is abused and allowed to harm this institution in the future.

Summary of recommendations:

(A) subject the Congress to the laws it passes and establish an independent Office of Compliance to ensure the enforcement of these laws;

(B) reduce legislative branch appropriations by 25 percent over five years, provided that the reduction plan shall avoid cuts in staff who provide constituent services;

(C) restrict retiring Members' ability to purchase district office furniture;

(D) establish uniform standards and accounting methods for congressional travel;

(E) limit federal funding for offices and staff of former House speakers.

IV. EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

Although not often viewed as important by the public and the press, several institutional reforms are needed if Congress is to do a more effective and efficient job of legislating. Simply put, the Congress does not work as well as it should, and part of the problem is the way it operates. We advocate a series of changes that will make the Congress a better deliberative body and more efficient in passing legislation.

We strongly urge a major reorganization of the sometimes haphazard committee jurisdictions. Establishing more rational standards for committee will reduce multiple committee referrals and divide the Congress' work more evenly. We strongly support the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in this area, and we urge the members of this committee to be bold and straightforward in their recommendations. In the event of the elimination of any committees or subcommittees, there should be an assurance the subject matter which that committee focused on is not lost.

One of the biggest frustrations we have as new Members is our schedules. We feel unproductive as we are torn between attending committee meetings or the sessions of the House. The manner in which the House operates makes us feel incapable of fully engaging ourselves in the matters before us.

The current House schedule works against thoughtful consideration of legislation. Committee schedules should be coordinated to reduce conflicts and overlap. In addition, committees should not meet when the House has legislation under consideration on the floor. Finally, we suggest that the House schedule be revised to create a more family-friendly atmosphere.

Copies of legislation should be available for review prior to consideration. If this is not feasible, the period of debate on the measure should be extended or an executive summary of the measure should be made available prior to consideration. Debate time on bills brought up under closed or modified rules should be lengthened so that all issues are fully explored. In addition, major legislation should be structured so that non-committee Members can engage sponsors in colloquy concerning the impact and scope of proposed legislation. Special orders should be limited in duration for individuals but also structured to encouraged longer debates between and among Members. Special orders have become a bonus of free television time—which some Members have seen as an opportunity to entertain their constituents for hours on end—rather than as a limited opportunity for Members to address specific issues of concern.

To assure that chairs are appropriately responsive to the Caucus, acting committee and subcommittee chairs should be subject to confirmation by the Caucus.

Many aspects of the current seniority system invite inspection. The 103rd Congress is the most diverse in history. We hope our leaders will reflect this diversity. Therefore, we recommend the Steering and Policy Committee make recommendations that represent the diversity of the Caucus and give Members wide ranging choices for committee and subcommittee chairs. To give more Members opportunities to serve as chairs, we recommend that no Member be allowed to chair more than one committee or subcommittee. Finally, so that more junior Members can be recognized for their diligence in attending hearings, we recommend that Members be called upon in their committees by order of appearance at the hearing.

Summary of recommendations:

(A) limit individual special orders and allow for Oxford-style debates;

(B) prohibit scheduling of committee sessions while the House is in session, and endeavor to minimize scheduling conflicts and overlap among committee meetings;

(C) require that copies of measures be available for a specified period of time before the measure can be considered; if not feasible, extend the period of debate on the measure which is not available in written form or require an executive summary of the measure to be available prior to consideration;

(D) extend general debate time if there is a closed or modified rule;

(E) allow time for colloquy for non-committee members to question leaders on bills on the floor in addition to extended debate;

(F) recommend to the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress that it aggressively work to revise committee jurisdictions, so as to avoid duplication and multiple referrals;

(G) allow for Democratic Caucus confirmation of acting committee and subcommittee chairs;

(H) direct the Steering and Policy Committee to give consideration to merit, length of service on the committee, diversity of the Caucus and commitment to the Democratic agenda when making nominations for committee chairs;

(I) require that no Member shall simultaneously serve as chair of more than one committee or subcommittee, or as chair of a committee and a subcommittee;

(J) adopt rules requiring committee members to be recognized in order of appearance for the purpose of making opening statements or asking questions of witnesses.

(K) deem the daily Journal read and approved, provided that within five days any member may propose a motion to correct the Journal, specifying the language to be removed and the language to be substituted or added;

(L) the motion to adjourn shall not be in order unless the House shall have been in session for at least five hours or the Speaker shall certify that the House has finished its business for the day; a motion to adjourn shall not be in order if offered by a member who has previously during the same day offered a motion to adjourn.

VI. CONCLUSION

This reform agenda is the work of many authors and builds on the ideas of other reforms who have taken important steps in making the Congress a more effective body. This is as it should be. Reform and revitalization should be a standard part of the work of the Congress. Today we take a significant step forward with a comprehensive reform agenda that touches on many important issues. But neither our work nor the reform process stops with the adoption of this report by the new Members of the Democratic Caucus.

We will draft specific language on Rules changes and help craft bills that embody the legislative principles outlined in this document. We will push for adoption of these initiatives, both in the Caucus and on the House floor.

What we propose is a renewal of the social contract between the American people and their representatives. The spirit of renewal is strong. We encourage all of our colleagues to join us in the timely consideration and adoption of these recommendations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAFALCE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 9 p.m. Thursday, April 1, and for the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SUNDQUIST (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 5, 1993, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1010. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's third special impoundment message for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 103-62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1011. A letter from the National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's annual report on disability for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 781(a)(8); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1012. A letter from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting corrective pages to the Commission's report of January 22, 1993, on details of the current disposition of previous U.S. exports of uranium [HEU]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1013. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional Federal, circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1014. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1015. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report entitled, "The Rights and Benefits of Temporary Employees of the Federal Government"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1016. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a study by the Army Corps of Engineers on possible flood control and related water resources needs in the Spicket River Basin and Tributaries, Massachusetts and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

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. SAWYER:

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that the Secretary of Commerce produce and publish, at least every 2 years, current data relating to the incidence of poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 1646. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on disperse red 279; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1647. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fastusol C blue 76L; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1648. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Hydroxy-4-Methoxy Benzohenone Sulfonic Acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1649. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a-Isopropyl-a-((N-methyl-N-homoveratryl)-g-aminopropyl)-3, 4-Dimethoxyphenylacetonitril-hydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1650. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3, 7, 11, 15 tetramethy 1-1-hexadecen-3-01; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1651. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2, 3, 5-Trimethylhydroquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1652. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on riboflavin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1653. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1654. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on diamino imid sp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1655. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-(4-aminophenyl)-6-methylbenzothiazole-7-sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1656. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sethoxydim; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1657. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-ethylamino-p-cresol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1658. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 6-amino-1-naphthol-3-sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1659. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on B-naphtol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1660. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on rosachloride lumps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1661. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on C.I. Pigment Yellow 138; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1662. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on C.I. Pigment Yellow 183; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1663. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Blue 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1664. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Blue 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BYRNE:

H.R. 1665. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish labeling requirements for products that emit low-frequency electromagnetic fields; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 1666. A bill to provide for the income tax treatment of certain distributions under a governmental plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BUNNING):

H.R. 1667. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit or deduction for interest paid on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 1668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of deposits under certain perpetual insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1669. A bill to require a temporary moratorium on leasing, exploration, and de-

velopment on lands of the Outer Continental Shelf off the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 1670. A bill to restore the 1994 cost-of-living adjustment in the regular military compensation of members of the uniformed services on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA:

H.R. 1671. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the acceptance of the responsibility of the Federal Government for the care and maintenance of the historic buildings in which the United States of America and its Government were created; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1672. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a grant to the Afna Education and Research Fund for the African-American Memorial Tomb of the Unknown Slaves and Historical Sculpture Garden; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1673. A bill to limit to $1,500,000,000 the amount expended by the Department of Defense during any fiscal year for the strategic defense initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. FURSE:

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reductions in Social Security benefits which are presently required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.R. 1675. A bill to provide for enhanced cooperation between the Federal Government and the U.S. civil aviation manufacturing industry in aeronautical technology research, development, design, and commercialization, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAMS (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. BAKER of California):

H.R. 1676. A bill to require the President to submit a plan for financing the losses from the resolution of savings and loan associations as a condition for the authorization of additional appropriations for such losses; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MORAN, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan):

H.R. 1677. A bill to provide grants to States and local entities to integrate education, medical, and social and human services to at-risk children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. EMERSON):

H.R. 1678. A bill making appropriations to begin a phase-in toward full funding of the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children [WIC] and of Head Start Programs, to expand the Job Corps Program for the year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 1679. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to nonrefoulement and asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. DIXON):

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for investments in small business enterprises owned by disadvantaged individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1681. A bill to waive the time limitations applicable to awarding the Medal of Honor posthumously to Ruben Rivers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 1682. A bill to repeal the Truth in Savings Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for mandatory coverage of services furnished by nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists under State medicaid plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1684. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act to provide consumers with additional information concerning octane ratings and requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORKILDSEN (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1685. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior the Essex Heritage District Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TORKILDSEN (for himself, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. FISH, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to put tools in the hands of American workers by reinstating a 10-percent investment tax credit for property used in manufacturing, production, extraction, or related purposes in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PARKER, Mr. WISE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1687. A bill to provide financial assistance to eligible local educational agencies to improve rural education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1688. A bill to designate wilderness, acquire certain valuable inholdings within National Wildlife Refuges and National Park System Units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Con. Res. 79. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any Federal health care legislation should not include price controls; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ZIMMER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. CANADY):

H. Res. 151. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the income tax imposed on Social Security benefits should not be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 152. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1578) to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

72. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, relative to rural counties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1689. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Moonshine*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58. Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 145. Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 146. Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 147. Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 163. Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 167. Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 173. Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 290. Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 302. Mr. MANTON and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 304. Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 334. Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 349. Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 439. Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 462. Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 467: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 522: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DANNER, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 535: Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 546: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 558: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. FISH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr.

VISCLOSKY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 643: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 662: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 664: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 667: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 697: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 700: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 723: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 743: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 771: Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 796: Mrs. MINK, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STOKES, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. SWETT, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 822: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 833: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 881: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H.R. 882: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 893: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 901: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 911: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 974: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 985: Mr. GALLO, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1013: Ms. THURMAN, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 1025: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 1056: Mr. CANADY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BORSKI, and Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1078: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1079: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1080: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1081: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1082: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1083: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1131: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1133: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CARR, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. SABO, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1141: Mr. CRANE, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1152: Ms. FURSE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1153: Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1167: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1168: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1195: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 1222: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1308: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KING, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ISTOOK, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. LEACH, Mr. APPLEGATE, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1312: Mr. BUNNING and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1355: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. INGLIS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HORN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1368: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASTLE, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1389: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R.1393: Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1402: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1406: Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOSS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 1407: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1408: Mr. BROWN of California and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1417: Mr. BLACKWELL and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1459: Mr. COBLE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HORN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1472: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1528: Mr. HENRY and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1539: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.J. Res. 153: Mr. KLEIN.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. CRAPO and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SWETT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 26: Mr. TALENT, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. ISTOOK.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. Res. 149

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1578) to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by the Congress of certain proposals by the President to rescind amounts of budget authority, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispened with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution, and which shall not exceed two hours, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, and one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules to accompany this resolution as an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. It shall first be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules: (1) a substitute amendment offered by Representative Castle of Delaware or Representative Solomon of New York; and (2) an amendment thereto by Representative Michel of Illinois. Said amendments may only be offered by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, and all points of order against said amendments are hereby waived. If the substitute amendment of Representative Solomon is not agreed to, it shall then be in order to consider two additional amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute: (1) an amendment thereto by Representative Michel of Illinois; and (2) a substitute amendment for the amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Minge of Minnesota; said amendments may only be offered by the named proponent or a designee, shall only be offered in the order specified, shall be considered as read, and all points of order against said amendments are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and support the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions."