

been disciplined, and at that time, at the request of people of the highest integrity, we made an exception for book royalties because we wanted to make room for legitimate exchange of ideas, and we had in mind books by people such as Mo Udall, Dick Bolling, and John Anderson. But we never dreamed that that exception would be used by any Member to cash in big on his public fame.

The Speaker's book deal has done such incredible damage to the public confidence in this House by making it appear that all of us are money grubbers, that that rule must be changed to eliminate it, and it must be changed now.

NO BUDGET, NO CONGRESSIONAL PAY

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans failed to pass the necessary appropriations bills, they precipitated a crisis last month which led to the longest Government shutdown in our Nation's history. The Government shutdown cost American taxpayers \$100 million a day because Mr. GINGRICH and the Republican leaders failed to pass a spending bill to keep the Government open. That sort of tragedy should not be repeated, and yet, tomorrow, it may be.

We now have another threat from the Republican leadership to close down the Government again, this time to send home some 300,000 Federal employees and once again leave the American taxpayers holding the bag.

Mr. GINGRICH insists that closing down the Government and sending home these employees is a matter of principle. Let me suggest something to the Speaker. It is a matter of principle if your paycheck is on the line, not if the paychecks of 300,000 Federal employees are on the line.

Mr. GINGRICH, you can put your paycheck on the line by supporting my bill: No budget, no pay. If Congress fails to keep the Government open, Congress does not get paid.

Mr. GINGRICH has killed this bill five times. We have to push forward to make sure that Congress does the responsible thing.

STATES NEED BETTER CONTROL OVER MEDICAID

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, this is what a prominent Governor has to say about reforming Medicaid: "If the Federal Government would just release us from its bureaucracy and nonsense, we'd make these programs better for those they serve, and we'd do it for less money."

Any guesses on who said this? It was Massachusetts Governor Bill Weld in a Wall Street Journal article from Monday.

Here's quote from another well-known Governor: "Medicaid mandates have put great stress on State budgets and undermined the States' ability to properly fund education and other important services."

Any guesses on this one? Well, this quote is from a document coauthored by Governor Bill Clinton in 1989.

As Governor, Bill Clinton warned that Medicaid mandates were too burdensome and in need of more State-level control.

Now, as President, Mr. Clinton has the opportunity to take care of that problem, but he has changed his position, and he has vetoed a bill that would have accomplished that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to join us in giving the States better control over our Medicaid system.

WELFARE REFORM MUST NOT PUNISH CHILDREN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of inside-the-beltway talk during the welfare reform debate about family caps, block grants, and maintenance of effort.

But I tell you, my friends, we have not heard much about the children. Let me lay out the facts plain and clear.

By shredding the safety net—by ending for the first time in 60 years the Federal guarantee of assistance for poor children—The Gingrich welfare bill will push at least 1.2 million more children into poverty, 1.2 million more children into poverty.

The bill tells children: If you're poor, don't get sick; don't get hungry; don't get cold because we don't think you're important. And, we don't want to guarantee that you have health care; food, and general assistance.

Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is not supposed to be about punishing poor children.

It should be about improving their lives by giving their parents the education, job training, and child care needed to get a job and get off welfare permanently.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Commit-

tee on National Security, Committee on Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the House that under rule IX, I plan to offer a privileged resolution and ask for its consideration to be scheduled within 2 days, as are required by the rules, as follows:

Whereas, on November 29, 1995, the House of Representatives considered S. 1060, a bill which had been passed by the Senate on July 25, 1995 to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government and for other purposes;

Whereas, on such date the House passed the bill without amount, the effect of which was an identical lobbying reform bill passed by both the House and the Senate;

Whereas, as of December 14, 1995, the bill passed by both Chambers has not been enrolled by the Senate and presented to the President in violation of constitutional requirements to so present;

Whereas, an unreasonable delay in the presentation of an enrolled bill to the President affects the integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint a committee of two Members of the House, one from each major party, to determine whether there has been unreasonable delay in transmitting the enrolled bill, S. 1060, to the President, and such committee shall promptly inform the Senate of the concern of the House of Representatives over the delay in the bill's presentation to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days of its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Speaker's designation at a later time. In the meantime, a form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated by the Speaker for consideration of the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my question would be as to the point you just made, as to whether or not this would be recognized as a legitimate question of privilege, would the fact that a virtually identical resolution under identical circumstances offered by then-minority whip GINGRICH in 1991, that that was ruled to be a question of privilege, would that be relevant to this decision?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will consider that at the time that the resolution is offered.

ENFORCING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND OTHER FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 293 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 293

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2621) to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and the former chairman, and my good friend and distinguished Member of this body, 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. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 293 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2621, a common sense measure designed to ensure that the promise made by this Government to the people who depend on Social Security and similar trust funds will be kept. We have repeatedly promised Americans that the money they pay into Government trust funds is being kept in trust for them, safe from being raided for short term fiscal and political emergencies. And the majority party in Congress intends to keep that promise even if the Clinton administration doesn't. This bill is necessary now because the Clinton administration—particularly the Treasury Secretary—has violated that trust in recent weeks by dipping into these reserve accounts in order to extend the Nation's credit and wiggle out of a commitment to put this Nation on a 7-year glide path toward a balanced budget. The new congressional majority has told the administration that we will not grant an extension of our national debt—which now stands at nearly \$5 trillion—until we have in place a plan to balance the budget. It would be irresponsible and immoral of us to keep writing uncovered checks from our children's accounts without such a plan in place. But fulfilling this commitment means making sure the administration can't stretch the rules and raid the trust funds to keep the red ink flowing. And so, on November 14 of this year, the House passed H.R. 2621 under suspension of the rules. Although the bill received a majority of the votes that day—247 ayes to 179 nays—it fell short of gaining the necessary two-thirds needed to pass under suspension. That's why the Rules Committee was asked to grant this rule. As is customary for legislation stemming from the Ways and Means Committee, House

Resolution 293 is a closed rule. However, since the time that the House first considered this bill, the Treasury Secretary has in fact borrowed from the trust funds. This rule therefore incorporates an amendment offered by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ARCHER, to restore those trust funds to their full value. This amendment will be adopted upon passage of the rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, during our Rules Committee hearing on this bill last week, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. GIBBONS, suggested that passing H.R. 2621 is a waste of time since the President is surely going to veto it. I am extremely puzzled and, frankly, quite dismayed to hear that this President would veto a measure designed to ensure the solvency and integrity of the Government trust funds, including the Social Security trust fund. Is President Clinton really in favor of raiding the Social Security trust fund? If in fact the President has made this ill-advised decision, I hope he will reconsider. If he doesn't, I hope America is listening. Those trust funds are based upon the trust of the people who have paid into them in good faith. They expect us to ensure that their money is being held safely by the Federal Government. Those funds are not designed to bail out the overspending of the Clinton administration nor are they to assist this administration in its effort to avoid agreeing to a balanced budget in 7 years. I know the President has previously said that preserving Social Security is a priority for his administration. He can live up to that rhetoric by joining us in this effort to enforce the public debt ceiling while protecting the trust funds.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 7, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	56	65
Modified Closed ³	49	47	20	23
Closed ⁴	9	9	10	12
Total	104	100	86	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 7, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).