

Let me just say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, this Member, speaking for himself, says this: I want to have leaders who write books. I would like to see leaders on the Democratic side of the aisle write books. I think that whether you agree with it or do not agree with it, Vice President GORE'S book that he wrote and received remuneration for provoked thought, provoked response, across the political spectrum, and for that reason was a very useful instrument in ginning up this mill of debate of the national forum.

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

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. We are going to be expecting about 12 inches of snow starting late tonight, and I am going to dig my pal and classmate, AL GORE'S, book out and read about global warming under those 12 inches of snow, especially if my fireplace gives out. I mean, it looks like we are getting colder, not warmer.

But it is still interesting to read the book, to get the other side. I like books. I have 4,000 at home. You have seen every one of them.

Mr. HUNTER. I am going to return his book. I have one of his MacArthur books that I promised to return for several years, and I promise, once again, that I will return that book soon.

Mr. DORNAN. We should have a carrier, the U.S.S. *Douglas MacArthur*.

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, in just a second.

Let me just say with respect to remuneration, in terms of what you can do to make money in this world, there is probably nothing more democratic, nothing more open, nothing more populist than to make your words available to millions of people, and if a person wants to buy your book, he pays through the book-purchasing process \$5 or \$6 to the author, and there is nothing that is less of a special interest than an average American purchasing a book to read because he wants to see someone's ideas.

□ 1540

And I think it does a disservice to the House, and I will tell the gentleman that he is going to have leaders on his side of the aisle who want to share their ideas with the world.

PROS AND CONS OF PUBLIC FIGURES WRITING BOOKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, why should I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]? Because he yielded to me? Why should I yield to

the new conscience of the House who is pro-gun, pro-life, pro-guts, pro-defense and has been giving us a hard time and yelled at me the other day? Of course I yield to the gentleman from California if he will promise to yield to the distinguished gentleman and my pal from the great State of Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. HUNTER. I will. Just finishing my thought, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DORNAN. He is pro-books, too.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just say I hope the gentleman from Missouri writes a book. And I think as one Member when he writes it I am going to purchase that book and read it, and I will ask the gentleman from California to yield to him.

Mr. DORNAN. I am now controlling the time and loving every second of it. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has been a good friend, and we worked together for a good many years on many pieces of legislation, many of which we agree on. I agree, I have no disagreement with Members writing books. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] missed the point. The point that bothers me and I think we need to clear up because I have seen it in the media, I saw it the other night on TV, we need to clear it up: What influence did Rupert Murdoch have in relation to the writing of the book and to the book contract and how much the Speaker is going to get? I do not believe that Teddy Roosevelt, AL GORE, or anybody else had any types of contract with any types of person. Now there may not be anything wrong with that. I am just asking that let us get it cleared up so that we know there is nothing wrong with it. Let the Speaker go ahead and write a book, I have no objection to his writing a book. My only question is what remuneration is in that contract, did the things that Rupert Murdoch and his companies have in relation to the Federal Government as to the impact on writing that book.

Mr. DORNAN. Fair question. I yield to the gentleman from San Diego for a fair answer.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just say to my friends almost every book that is published by a major figure is published through a major publishing house.

Mr. VOLKMER. Correct.

Mr. HUNTER. Most books that are published by a major publishing house are published with a book advance. I understand there is not going to be any advance. Most of them are published with an advance. I would say the gentleman is stating we should presume that there may be a problem because there may have been influence wielded because a Member of the House leadership has followed the American tradition of writing a book and publishing it with a publishing house, a fairly large well-known publishing house in the United States, somehow has something wrong with it, so that we should go out with absolutely no evidence of any im-

propriety and investigate that because someone is going to write a book.

Now I would say that the one thing that we deal with, our tools that we use in this business are words, written words and spoken words. There is nothing more natural for a public figure whether he is Democrat or Republican than to write a book. And so the idea that the gentleman has now established a new presumption of guilt for people whose stock in trade is words, that when they put these words into books and sell them to the public the relationships that they have with publishers have to be examined I think does a disservice to this House and to all public figures who would write. I want to give that person on the street a chance to buy that book, and if he pays \$4 out of the \$20 cost of that book to the person would write it, if that is the Speaker of the House, then I think that is not influence.

REMEMBERING THOMAS: GUILT, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE CHILD WHO NEVER WAS

Mr. DORNAN. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will stay—the snow is not due until after midnight—through my special order, I am going to read an article appearing in America's No. 1 liberal political newspaper, the Washington Post, on abortion, by an excellent Washington Post staff writer, Phil McCombs. Now, if I were to write a book today it would be on the premiere core central issue of all the social issues, the issue that I believe is tearing apart families in our lower income categories and families in our higher income categories, and that is the destruction of innocent life in the womb. And if the gentlemen, Mr. HUNTER and Mr. VOLKMER, my good pro-life friends stay and hear this article, this column today that I am going to read, I think you will both realize that there are lots of subjects that still need to be written about in depth with great compassion and feeling.

I think that I hear Mr. VOLKMER'S point clearly that if a publishing house has business before this great House and Chamber, then we have to look at those relationships. I think our dynamic Speaker is willing to do that.

Let me reclaim my time. May I ask the gentlemen to trade places because I want that lectern and then stay around if you want to comment later.

First of all, let me ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], "What are you, about 6 foot 2?" I am so tired of people coming up to me and saying, "My Gosh, you are 5 inches taller than I thought you were." It goes on regularly. I do not know whether it is my voice sitting in for Rush Limbaugh or something about here. But a Member finally taught me something. He said, "I notice, Bob, that you will bring up the lectern, put the mike down," and I guess in that way I look like I am 5 foot 3. SONNY BONO is about 5 foot 4 and look how he comes across. They said, "If you drop it way down, pull the

mike up, then you look like John Wayne, 6 foot 4." So from now on, low lectern, reading glasses, recapture my mother-given height. My mom's birthday would have been yesterday, 95 years old. She was a great Douglas MacArthur fan. She had gone on a vacation to the 1928 Olympics where my dad was an assistant boxing coach. They had already been engaged 5 or 6 years. They got married the next year. I hope that we will see a carrier named after Douglas MacArthur. Yes, give me back my book on MacArthur, "Remembrances."

Now, let me get deadly serious. In today's Style section of the Washington Post is a column called "Remembering Thomas." Above it, it says with an exclamation point and underlined, "Oh, Man," with an exclamation mark. And that is underlined. Then it goes on "Remembering Thomas, Responsibility, Guilt and a Child Who Never Was." By Phil McCombs, Washington Post staff writer.

This year's March for Life in which 45,000 abortion opponents picketed the Supreme Court, didn't have an emotional impact on me that these events often do. I was on my way out of town on business, and scarcely noticed.

Looking at the news report later, it seemed that everyone had been on his or her best behavior.

Now a footnote: One of the stations, I think it was ABC, reported 31 people were arrested during the march. They conceded to my daughter-in-law, Terri Ann Dornan, that they were mistaken. The arrests were at a different location and no part of the march. So the Washington Post columnist with a different objective here corrects that. Peaceful march. I was leading the march with the great Roger Cardinal Mahoney of Los Angeles.

The abortion opponents were making it plain that they oppose the use of violence to close clinics.

That was the principal thrust of my speech before those 45,000—I thought it was more, like 55,000–60,000 people. And it goes on:

And after counterdemonstrations by abortion rights advocates, as we're careful to call them, were rare.

It's all a little confusing to me. I do not know anyone who—in his or her heart—doesn't hate abortion. And it seems odd to see Christian conservatives so eager to force their will through the armed authority of the State when they already have at hand the far more powerful weapon of prayer.

Anyway, I like prayer. It is all I have left. And pain.

When the abortion was performed, I was out of town on business too. I made sure of that. Whatever physical, emotional and spiritual agony the woman suffered, I was not by her side to support her.

I turned my face away. My behavior was in all respects craven, immoral.

For some instinctual reason, or just imaginatively, I've come to believe that it was a boy, a son whom I wanted killed because, at the time, his existence would have inconvenienced me. I'd had my fun. He didn't fit into my plans.

His name, which is carved on my heart, was Thomas.

My feelings of responsibility and guilt are undiminished by the fact that the woman had full legal authority to make the decision on her own, either way, without consulting me or even informing me. In fact, she consulted in an open fashion reflecting our shared responsibility, and I could have made a strong case for having the child. Instead, I urged her along the path of death.

And skipped town.

It's not a lot of help, either—emotionally or spiritually—that the high priests of the American judiciary have put their A-OK on this particular form of what I personally have come to regard as the slaughter of innocents. After all, it's the task of government to decide whom we may or must kill, and not necessarily to provide therapeutic services afterward. In the Army I remember being trained at public expense in the "spirit of the bayonet," which is, simply put, "to kill." The spirit of abortion is the same, in my view, though the enemy isn't shooting back.

I feel like a murderer—which isn't to say that I blame anyone else, or think anyone else is a murderer.

It's just the way I feel, and all the rationalizations in the world haven't changed this. I still grieve for little Thomas. It is an ocean of grief. From somewhere in the distant past I remember the phrase from Shakespeare, "the multitudinous seas incarnadine."

When I go up to the river on vacation this summer, he won't be helping me boating with me on the lovely old wooden runabout that I can't bring myself to discard, either.

He won't be lying on the grass by the tent at night, looking at the starry sky and saying, "What's that one called, Dad?"

Because there was no room on the Earth for Thomas.

He's dead.

The latest numbers show abortions in America have been running at about 1.5 million annually. That's a lot of pain.

Secular men's groups have tended to be focused on the "no say, no pay" issue. "These men feel raped," says Mel Feit of the National Center for Men. "They lose everything they worked for all their lives. In many cases they had an agreement with the woman not to have a baby and when she changes her mind they call me up and say, 'How can she do this to me? How can she get away with it?'" Feit plans to bring suit in federal court.

In more interested in the traumatic pain that many men, as well as women, often feel after an abortion. A healing process of recognition grieving and ultimately forgiveness is needed.

"There's a lot of ambivalence for men when they get in touch with their pain," says Eileen C. Marx, formerly communications director for Cardinal James A. Hickey of Washington and now a columnist for Catholic publications. "They didn't have the physical pregnancy, so often they feel they're not entitled to the feelings of sadness and anger and guilt and loss that women often feel."

She tells of one man, a friend, whose wife had an abortion. "He pleaded with her not to have it. He said his parents would raise the child, or they could put it up for adoption. The marriage broke up as a result of the abortion and other issues. He was really devastated by the experience."

Marx has recently written about a post-abortion healing ministry called Project Rachel, in which more men are becoming involved—husbands, boyfriends and even grandfathers. There are 100 Project Rachel branches, including one in Washington.

I found it helpful just talking with Marx, a caring person, on the phone, though it was a little tough when she mentioned being pregnant and hearing the heartbeat and feeling "this wonderful celebration of the life inside you."

She said not to be too hard on myself, that healing is about forgiveness and God forgives me.

I said sure, that's right, but some things are still hard.

Like looking in the mirror.

□ 1550

What a courageous column, Phil.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good friend, gone to his eternal reward, a good man. We were in the Watts riots together. Sixty-five, I bumped into him, 3 years later in Vietnam was a correspondent for CBS Radio. Gosh, am I going to forget his name? I guess I am—Bill—Bill Stout, Bill Stout. He told me that every time he drove up Hollywood Boulevard he looked up at the old medical building at the northeast corner of Highland and Hollywood Boulevard, right by the famous footprints in front of the Grauman's Chinese Theater, and he said, "On a certain floor my son died." When he wrote this column for the L.A. Times he said, "Twenty-two years ago," so now it must be 35 years ago. "I've never gotten over the pain. It wrecked my marriage, and I know my son died up there in the hands of some abortionist, on the floor, wherever." And Bill Stout was a proud mainstream liberal, as I am sure Phil McCombs is.

We are not going to get away from this abortion debate, Mr. Speaker. It will come back this summer. We are going to try to roll back all those obnoxious, in our face, Executive orders from Clinton on the very anniversary, the 20th anniversary, of the Roe versus Wade decision, a decision built on a lie, entrenched in a lie.

Norma McCorvey, the Jane Roe in that case, never had an abortion, never was raped, lied here way through it. Young Sarah Weddington, a brilliant red-haired lawyer that carried the case, told her, "Don't tell the world you weren't raped."

Norma McCorvey has had three daughters. They still are estranged from the mother because she tried to kill all three and did not make it, had them all. She travels broken, on drugs, off drugs. She is out there being used by the pro-abortion, multibillion-dollar industry.

But guess what happened yesterday, Mr. Speaker? Yesterday morning, Clinton asked everyone at the prayer breakfast to pray for him, but he had put in our face within that very 1-day period an abortionist to replace the Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders. This is a male version of Joycelyn Elders and worse. She was a doctor, but she never said she performed abortions, and guess what? I hope the Senate is going to not only reject Dr. Foster, Clinton's nomination, but will do what

we already warned Clinton in writing we were going to do, roll the Surgeon General back into the Assistant Secretary for Health in Health and Human Services where it always was.

Our friend, Ronald Reagan, made a mistake, DUNCAN. He promised the Surgeon General job to two people. They said, "Mr. President, we already have a Secretary of Health, and it's the same job." So our friend, out of his simple honest mistake, split the Surgeon General away from the Assistant Secretary of Health and gave it to Dr. Koop. He did not shave his beard. He brought back the white uniform. And we had an Amish pseudo-admiral which is what he looked like. Koop then threw up his hands on pro-life, this brilliant Philadelphia surgeon who made a well-deserved, sterling reputation for separating twins, Siamese twins, some of them joined at the brain, and then became sort of brilliant on antismoking, but sort of an apologist for the so-called pro-choice movement because he said all was lost.

With columns like Mr. McCombs', Mr. Speaker, all is not lost.

Now, is Clinton going to be the President 2 years from now? No. I said that in a 1-minute this morning. No way.

Here is the book, "The Agenda." Read "Inside the White House," DUNCAN, and then read the new book that is on the front page of the Washington Post called "First in His Class."

□ 1600

If you read just these three books, you will see that sometime this summer, late summer, when the Watergate stories are exploding across America on alternative media; that is, radio and television talk shows, on the front page of our biggest newspapers, all the other 1,750-some papers, he cannot survive this. He will resign. And when the Post, the same paper that Mr. McCombs is a staff writer for, makes a calculated decision to bring down the White House again, as they did, for good or wrong with Nixon—he did it to himself—they are going to wreck this Presidency and they are not doing it to help us, Mr. HUNTER, they are doing it to get a big headstart on the Presidential season that is already beginning.

So the Post will have in the White House someone that they accept philosophically, and that way they will not see him bringing down the White House and adding another 20 Republicans from that side of the aisle over to this side of the aisle; people who will become Republicans.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say that I stayed on the floor because I really appreciate the words of the gentleman and the wisdom of the gentleman, my great friend from California. This is a house of mechanics, word mechanics. That is what legislation is. There is probably no one more proficient in reminding us that we are not just mechanics, but we are holders and transferrers, if you

will, of values, the values of our constituents. And in this area, this area of pro-life, there is a great, great need for people who have voices as articulate as the gentleman who is speaking right now, the best speaker in the House of Representatives. I want to thank the gentleman.

I have to go back to our beloved State of California, but I want to thank the gentleman for all the time he has taken over many, many years in talking about this issue. I am also reminded when he put 40 hours in an airplane going to Somalia and back to give a full report to every family member who had a beloved one who had been killed in Mogadishu, and performed such a wonderful service in doing that. I have to take off, but your words are very eloquent today. I hope that Americans listen.

Mr. DORNAN. While 1,300,000,000 listeners and watchers of C-SPAN are watching us, I might use this opportunity to tell them something. The newly named National Security Committee—you and I preferred the old title, maybe both, Armed Services and National Security—has come down to 5 subcommittees. Our great chairman, Navy Capt. FLOYD SPENCE, of South Carolina, is no longer able to take a subcommittee. He will be a shepherd, shepherding his five Napoleonic marshals, his subcommittee chairmen. You have the most important preferred subcommittee, you are the chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement. HERB BATEMAN, of Virginia, has the great area where the U.S.S. *Ronald Reagan* and U.S.S. *Harry Truman* will be built. He has the Readiness Subcommittee. He would have been chairman of Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee if we had not done away with it, which I agreed with. Then CURT WELDON, of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has R&D, which I am on, and you have been the ranking member in the past. I am chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee. JOEL HEFLEY, of Cheyenne Mountain, NORAD, that great part of the Colorado Air Force Academy, is the fifth marshal for installations.

The five of us, together with our two Committees on Intelligence that have national security responsibility, and I got first pick there, Chairman DORNAN of Technical and Tactical Intelligence, JERRY LEWIS, our colleague, the chairman of the other, including human intelligence, and the CIA. Of our seven national security subcommittees, who dreamed on the night of November 8 I would be chairman of two out of seven, and you would have the most important one, to modernize our service with Comanche, V-22, *Arleigh Burke* destroyers, and these new carriers.

We have a battle on our hands in an approaching bankrupt nation to live up to the preamble of the Constitution to provide for the common defense.

All five of us chairmen voted yesterday to take defense above \$200 million out of a simple line-item veto. I no-

ticed FLOYD SPENCE was with us and many of the members of Armed Services, now National Security. We have a tough fight ahead of us.

If you are not in a rush, just listen to this from Bob Woodward's book, "The Agenda." Because of the new rules protecting, not AL GORE, not the Supreme Court Justice, the Chief Justice or the Associates, but only the Presidency of the United States, I will be very careful how I read this on the House floor. I will use expletives deleted.

Here is page 287 in "The Agenda," "Inside the White House," by Bob Woodward, who really along with Carl Bernstein together as investigative reporters caused the resignation of the one and only President in American history, Richard Nixon. And I for one have never said Mr. Nixon had not created his own fate.

In the middle of page 287 it says, Clinton speaking to Mr. KERREY, KERREY says, "The Constitution gives you the option, but I wouldn't take it." And you will have to read the book to see what they are talking about.

Clinton again pleaded with KERREY that he needed his vote for the largest tax increase in all of recorded history of man and womankind.

"My Presidency is going to go down," he said sharply, by now shouting. KERREY shouted back, getting fed up, "I do not like the argument that I am bringing the Presidency down."

This is a man who joined the Navy Seals. That is like being a paratrooper like you, DUNCAN, being a fighter pilot, being a special forces sniper, a commando, or a marine going behind the enemy lines for weeks at a time. A Navy seal is the best of the best. It is like carrier landing at night. This is slightly built, thin panther like BOB KERREY, who left a leg in Vietnam, and if he gets elected President can put himself in the gallery as a Medal of Honor winner and then can run down and talk about himself.

He says, yelling back, "I don't like the argument I am bringing the Presidency down." Clinton shouted, "Defeat would be precisely that," if that huge tax increase went down. KERREY could not flee from responsibility. KERREY bellowed, "I really resent your argument that somehow I am responsible for your Presidency surviving."

Clinton, with one of the most common, foul expletive deleted words in the English language, "expletive deleted you," Clinton yelled.

Bottom of the page, 287. I turned to 288 when I was reading this a few months back, and I expected to see Navy seal KERREY returning the compliment about engaging in activity with yourself. But KERREY felt he always tried to be respectful of the Commander-in-Chief. But he also wanted to defend himself. So he continued shouting back.

Clinton pressed only two things. He had to have KERREY's vote. "I need it," he said at one point plaintively. He

said if KERREY denied him the vote, KERREY would wreak national havoc.

"I have got the responsibility for me," the Senator replied. "I have got my vote. My vote matters. I vote based on what I believe is right. Always have. I don't particularly in big issues like this like to shave my vote. So that is where it is."

"Fine," Clinton said bruisingly. "OK, if that is what you want, you go do it."

They both crashed their phones down. Clinton was irate. He turned to his advisers after the conversation and said, "It is going to be a no." Clinton was wrong. KERREY voted yes later. He made a speech on national television why he didn't want to bring the Presidency down, why he would vote yes. This is just the end of 1993.

And then Senator BOB KERREY extracted from the White House the promise to be made chairman of a commission on our impending fiscal disaster. He did a good job chairing that committee.

My colleague from southern California CHRIS COX, was on it. Ask Congressman COX about that commission. They just turned in their report. The media did not give that report proper attention. It got short shrift. The report said if this Chamber doesn't complete our Contract With America, stay focused on these fiscal issues while we still, after April or May, handle the serious cultural meltdown and the destruction of the American family, the garbage that Hollywood is pumping into our culture, I don't know what we can do about that except plead with their good common sense, but we can do all of this in this House. And if we don't, Senator KERREY said there will only be 3 line items on the budget in about 20 years. We will close down all the courts, let all the Federal judges go, including the Supreme Court. No more Federal marshals, no FBI, no Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, no antinarcotics program.

That will solve that debate. There will only be three things left in the budget, just three: Interest on the national debt, which will then be way over \$10 trillion; Social Security, which will create a generational war, because only the people who have aged past my age a little bit will be reaping way beyond what they put in the system; and the third category is Medicare and Medicaid.

□ 1610

Health care, Social Security, interest on the debt. Is that where we are headed?

As I said this morning, Mr. Speaker, BOB KERREY carrying the banner of the great Democratic Party, the oldest in the Nation's history, Thomas Jefferson's party, the least government is the best government, that is why they still sit to the treasured right although we switched on committees, that party with BOB KERREY at its top is going to make an exciting campaign next year.

A THANK YOU TO THE STAFF

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today because 1 month ago I was sworn into the House of Representatives with 434 other American citizens.

I want to take a moment, though, to thank the men and women who make this process work: The Members' personal staffs, the staff of the committees, the members of the Clerk's office and the cloakroom, the pages and their families who have allowed them to participate in this great democracy.

These individuals arrive here at the Capitol very early in the morning and they leave very late to do the people's business. The Members get all the attention from the press and the media. The staff gets all the grief.

This 1 minute is dedicated sincerely and thankfully to those individuals who make this process work, those people who work for the U.S. Government. Yes, indeed, we are proud and fortunate to have each and every one of them working for this country.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a), rule XI, I submit the Rules of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services for the 104th Congress as adopted on January 12, 1995.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS

RULE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. (a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in the Committee and subcommittees.

(b) Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

2. The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the Committee under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

3. The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE II. POWERS AND DUTIES

1. The powers and duties of the Committee are all those such as are enumerated or contained in the Rules of the House and the rulings and precedents of the House or the Committee.

2. For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized—

(a) to sit and act at such times and places with the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or had adjourned, and to hold hearings; except as provided in Rule XI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House;

(b) to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate, and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith. The ranking minority Member of the full Committee or the relevant subcommittee shall be notified in advance at such times as any Committee funds are expended for investigations and studies involving international travel; and

(c) to require, by subpoena or otherwise (subject to clause 3(a)), the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, in whatever form, as it deems necessary. The Chairperson of the Committee, or any Member designated by the Chairperson, may administer oaths to any witness.

Subpoenas

3. (a) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee under clause 2(c) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under clause 2(c) may be delegated to the Chairperson of the Committee pursuant to such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairperson of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(b) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee under clause 2(c) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

Review of continuing programs

4. The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph, a government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(c) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

5. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

Budget Act reports

6. The Committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget—

(a) the Committee's views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(b) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within the Committee's jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

7. As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting