Gillmor	Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen
Gilman	Linder	Roth
Gingrich	Livingston	Roukema
Glickman	Lloyd	Rowland
Goodlatte	Machtley	Royce
Goodling	Mann	Santorum
Goss	Manzullo	Sarpalius
Grams	McCandless	Saxton
Grandy	McCollum	Schaefer
Greenwood	McCrery	Schiff
Gunderson	McCurdy	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McDade	Shaw
Hancock	McHugh	Shays
Hansen	McInnis	Shuster
Hastert	McKeon	Sisisky
Hayes	McMillan	Skeen
Hefley	Meehan	Slattery
Herger	Meyers	Smith (MI)
Hobson	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hoke	Minge	Smith (TX)
Horn	Molinari	Snowe
Houghton	Moorhead	Solomon
Huffington	Morella	Spence
Hunter	Myers	Stearns
Hutchinson	Nussle	Stenholm
Hutto	Orton	Stump
Hyde	Oxley	Sundquist
Inglis	Parker	Swett
Inhofe	Paxon	Talent
Istook	Payne (VA)	Tanner
Jacobs	Penny	Tauzin
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Thomas (CA)
Kasich	Pombo	Thomas (WY)
Kim	Porter	Thurman
King	Portman	Torkildsen
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Upton
Klug	Quillen	Valentine
Knollenberg	Quinn	Vucanovich
Kolbe	Ramstad	Walker
Kyl	Ravenel	Walsh
Lancaster	Regula	Weldon
Lazio	Ridge	Wolf
Leach	Roberts	Young (AK)
Levy	Roemer	Young (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Zeliff
Lewis (FL)	Rohrabacher	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Barcia	Gephardt	Moran
Conyers	Henry	Packard
Dornan	Maloney	Tucker
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Wilson
Frost	Moakley	

So the resolution was not agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said resolution was not agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

¶86.8 WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2490

Mr. GORDON, by direction of the Committee on Rules, called up the following resolution (H. Res. 221):

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning on page 17, line 14, through line 24; beginning on page 18, line 16, through line 20; beginning on page 23, line, through line 12; beginning with ''*:Provided*'' on page 27, line 2, through ''1341'' on line 6; beginning on page 48, line 11, through page 49, line 8; beginning on page 51, line 16, through line 23; beginning on page 53, line 7, through line 22; beginning on page 54, line 15, through page 55, line 14; beginning on page 56, line 1, through page 57, line 9; beginning on page 57, line 14, through page 58, line 11; and beginning on page 58, line 15, through page 59, line 2. Where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, a point of order against matter in the balance of the paragraph may be applied only within the balance of the paragraph and not against the entire paragraph. The amendments en bloc specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to be offered by Representative Tauzin of Louisiana or a designee may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 211 is laid on the table.

When said resolution was considered.

After debate,

Mr. GORDON withdrew said resolution.

¶86.9 NOTICE REQUIREMENT—CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION—H. RES. 211

Mr. GOSS, pursuant to clause 4(c) of rule XI, announced his intention to call up the resolution (H. Res. 211) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, on Friday, July 23, 1993.

¶86.10 PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GEPHARDT, rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 223):

Whereas the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia on July 19, 1993 announced that the former Postmaster of the House of Representatives was pleading guilty to criminal counts of conspiracy and aiding and abetting the embezzlement of public funds,

Whereas the operation of the House Post Office during the tenure of the former Postmaster was the subject of a bipartisan Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office of the Committee on House Administration,

Whereas the former Task Force published a public report on July 24, 1992 in which were included portions of transcripts of its proceedings,

Whereas the House on July 22, 1992, voted to provide both the public report and all the records of the former Task Force to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and to the Department of Justice, but declined to make the transcripts of the former Task Force's proceedings public,

Whereas one of the reasons the House declined to make the transcripts of proceedings of the former Task Force public at that time was a concern that such release not compromise an ongoing criminal proceeding conducted by the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia,

Whereas the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia on July 21, 1993 communicated to the Speaker and the Republican Leader his strong objection to the public release of the records of the former Task Force as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
U.S. ATTORNEY,
Washington, DC, July 21, 1993.

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

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: We have been advised that the House of Representatives may be considering the public release of previously confidential materials generated during the inquiry conducted last year by the Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office. I am writing to express this Office's serious concern that the release of such materials could have a significant adverse effect on the ongoing criminal investigation being conducted by this Office into matters associated with the House Post Office. Accordingly, I ask you not to authorize the release of such materials.

Last year, this Office endeavored to work cooperatively with the Task Force, so as to enable the Task Force to conduct its mandated operations-and-management review of the Post Office, without invading the integrity of the criminal investigation. After completing its review in July of last year, the Task Force prudently concluded that many of the materials that it had collected or generated—including deposition and interview transcripts and tapes—ought to remain confidential, in part because the publication of such materials posed a significant potential to compromise the ongoing grand jury investigation. That potential remains today. The investigation is continuing, and inevitably involves many of the same witnesses and transactions that the Task Force inquiry included.

For these reasons, I strongly request that the House refrain from releasing additional materials generated by the Task Force inquiry.

Sincerely,

J. RAMSEY JOHNSON,
U.S. Attorney.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that, when the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia at any time informs the House that he has no objection to the public release of the transcripts of proceedings of the former Task Force, then the House immediately shall take up and bring to vote the question of the release of the transcripts of proceedings of the former Task Force;

Resolved further, That the Speaker is directed to communicate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the request of the House that he promptly advise the House when he determines that he has no objection to the public release of the transcripts of proceedings of the former Task Force; and

Resolved further, That the Clerk is directed to transmit promptly such communication of the Speaker and a copy of this Resolution to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.

Pending consideration of said resolution,

¶86.11 POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER made a point of order against consideration of said resolution as not constituting a question of privilege, and said:

''Mr. Speaker, the resolution as presented to the House does not constitute a question of privilege. There is no violation of rule IX where questions of privilege have to relate to particular items of the House, primarily the saftety, dignity, and integrity of its proceedings. There is no allegation in this resolution that any such matter has taken place, nor is there any disciplinary action that is in the resolution.

''So, therefore, this does not constitute an appropriate question of privilege to bring before the House.''

The SPEAKER overruled the point of order, and said:

''The Chair believes that the resolution meets the requirements of rule IX