

RECORD ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1022, RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-BENEFIT ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-51) on the resolution (H. Res. 96) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1022) to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk assessments and through the consideration of costs and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet early next week on two bills to improve the federal regulatory process. Next Monday, February 27, the committee will meet at 5 p.m. to consider a rule for H.R. 926, the Regulatory Reform and Relief Act, better known as the Reg Flex Act. Members should be aware that this rule may include a provision giving priority in recognition to Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. In this case, the preprinting of amendments is optional.

On Tuesday, February 28, at 2 p.m., the Committee on Rules will meet to consider a rule for H.R. 925, the Private Property Protection Act. In this case the rule may include, and I would just emphasize this, may include a requirement as opposed to an option that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to consideration of the bill for amendment.

Amendments to be preprinted should be titled, "Submitted for Printing Under Clause 6 of Rule XXIII," signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table.

Each of these bills may be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, with a possible overall time limitation on the amending process.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, was I correct in understanding that amendments that are preprinted will have priority under the proposal?

Mr. SOLOMON. Amendments for the first, for the Reg Flex Act would have priority of recognition, but it is only optional that they be filed, be printed.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, would my understanding be correct though, that a Member of the House, not a member of the committee, who has his amendment printed in the RECORD would have priority over a member of the committee?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman would please restate that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Would a Member, not a member of the committee, have priority, who has his amendment printed in the RECORD, have priority over a member of the committee in offering such an amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Not over the committee chairman, no.

Mr. BEREUTER. Would a Member who has his amendment printed have priority over a member of the committee whose amendments were not printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SOLOMON. That would be subject to the recognition of the chair, but in most cases, yes.

Mr. BEREUTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the reason this gentleman was so upset when we took up the crime bill, block grant, is that the parliamentarian informed the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that no matter how long I stood here, and I waited for nearly 7 hours to offer an amendment, but not being a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole was informed by the parliamentarian that the Chairman had no option but to continue to recognize members of the Committee on the Judiciary for amendments, be they printed or not printed. And many, many, many were nonprinted, and they continued to be offered. And Members of the House who were not members of the Committee on the Judiciary were shut out from offering amendments.

In fact, I just directed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules about how this process does not serve Members well who are not members of the committee debating the bill before us.

So I would hope that the Committee on Rules might at least give all Members priority whose amendments are preprinted. I understand that the members of the committee and certainly the chairman should have priority for amendments that are printed in the RECORD, but you see we can be completely shut off from offering our amendments if we are not members of the committee. That is exactly what happened to this gentleman.

So I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he would give that matter some consideration.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. We most certainly will. Of course, the recognition is always subject to the Speaker, to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. But certainly, I would just advise the gentleman that we would try to work with the managers of the bill to make sure that we are going to get the proper recognition.

Of course, if there are dilatory tactics, stalling tactics, that sometimes can put the gentleman in that particular position, in an awkward position. We would hope that that would never happen.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for the purpose of discussing the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first give the Members a tentative schedule for the month of March. As has been the case for the month of February, votes may be scheduled for as early as 2 p.m. on Mondays. However, as often as has been possible in the past, if we can work out an agreement, we may be able to hold votes over until 5 p.m. on Mondays.

As many Members on both sides of the aisle have long distances to travel to their districts, our leadership will do everything we can to notify members as soon as possible so that they can finalize their travel plans.

Also the House will not be in session on Friday, March 17, or on Monday, March 20, for a district work period. We expect no votes until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21.

We have a very heavy legislative schedule for the month of March, and it is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and districts by 3 p.m. on Fridays. However, if the schedule requires us to work later on Fridays or meet during weekends, we will advise Members at the earliest possible time.

□ 1410

On another note, it is our intention to change the time the House meets for legislative business on Wednesday from 11 to 10 a.m. It is our hope that this schedule change will allow us to help Members leave for their districts by 3 p.m. on Fridays.

Perhaps this would be an appropriate time for me to yield to the gentleman from California about the March schedule, prior to going on to next week's schedule.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not think in February we have had any votes before 5 o'clock on Mondays. I am certainly hopeful that that will continue to be the case. The concern that I have expressed in a prior dialog with the leader is simply that those from west of the Rockies lose an entire Sunday afternoon in order to be here for late votes on Monday, and I would hope that we could always find a way to avoid that, including, if it were in the majority's plans, Monday, February 27, when I understood we may be asked to be here at 3:30.

We have all made plans for this particular weekend that would allow us to get 6:30 and 7 a.m. flights on Monday morning in order to be here for the 5 o'clock voting time that was announced.

I would certainly hope that we would not have any early votes in March, and I hope we are not going to break our word by having any votes earlier on this coming Monday, the 27th, because I think it really is totally counter-productive for Members who really do need to be with their families, or do need to spend time with their constituents.

It has been hard enough in the early going of this Congress to maintain that kind of rapport.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, let me begin my response by the observation at the outset of the February schedule we advised Members of the possibility of votes being as early as 2 o'clock on Mondays.

Yes, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] rightly observes that, thanks largely to the splendid cooperation we have gotten in negotiating with the minority, we have to this point been able to avoid any votes before 5 o'clock on Monday.

I know I am grateful for that, and I can tell the Members, so many times in the past that I have gotten off my plane and been at home in Dallas, TX, and seen the California folks changing planes at that point, and I can appreciate the struggle for that long distance travel.

We are still hopeful. However, on Monday next we will have a rule that will require to be voted on about 3:30 on Monday next. It is an open rule. We do not intend to call for a recorded vote on that. We must be prepared, though, for the possibility that somebody on the minority side might call for a vote on that open rule, and in that case, must advise Members of the possibility, even some degree of probability, of a vote at 3:30 next Monday.

If we had an agreement, no vote would be called for, then we could advise Members otherwise.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that in the rule that will be brought up at 2:30, it provides for 2 hours of general debate on the risk assessment bill. Therefore, if there is no

vote on the open rule, then we would go directly to 2 hours of general debate.

It means that the gentleman could be here as late as 6 o'clock and not expect a vote even before that time, which would solve all their problems.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and I do not know this for a fact, but there may be a Member on our side who will ask for a vote. I want to make that warning. I do not know that, but I want to make the warning.

However, I would remind the distinguished majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that it is my understanding he has the unilateral authority to roll the vote on the rule until 4:30 or 5 o'clock. That would not be something we would object to.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is very difficult to consider the acceptability to the body of rolling the vote on a rule making in order a debate that would ensue in the intervening time, so it seems to me that in the interests of conforming with the accepted procedures of the House, if a vote is ordered at 3:30, we would be required to take that vote in order to commence with the debate that we hope or expect in order to accomplish an already crowded schedule.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain why there may be a problem here. If we are talking about a genuinely open rule, as those that have been historically understood here, there would not be a problem. My understanding is that we are talking not about an open rule, which I had always understood to be anyone could get up until the conclusion of people's interest and offer amendments, but a rule with one of these 10-hour limitations.

I know we have not yet made English the national language by some legislation, but I had thought English was still the language of these debates, though. An open rule is not one where there is a 10-hour limit.

In fact, we just heard one of the very distinguished Members on the other side, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], pointing out that during one of the crime bills he stood around for 7 hours and was not able to offer an amendment.

A rule in which the leading Member of the House is unable to offer an amendment is not an open rule. It is, frankly, mislabeling in the extreme to call one of these 10-hour limits an open rule, especially since we done some compilation on the four 10-hour bills that I have seen, and anywhere from 2 hours and 40 minutes to 3½ hours has gone just for voting.

Obviously, voting is important. we have had people call rollcalls on unani-

mous votes, in one case, 405 to nothing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. CLINGER], and that came out of the 10 hours.

So if we were talking about an open rule, with the possibility after 3 or 4 days or 2 days of closing it down, that would be a different story. However, when we are talking about one of these 10-hour rules, where when the House is unruly, that comes out of the debate time; when there is a point of order, that comes out of the debate time; when we are talking about that kind of restriction, where many, many Members have been prevented from offering amendments, it is not an open rule, and that is why there might be a vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I have here a record of all of the rules from last year that were brought to this floor under an open rule, except for the fact that they had time constraints.

They were extremely important bills, such as the Employment Retirement Security Act, the Black Lung Benefits Restoration Act, the Presidio Management, the State and local governments interstate waste control, very important; the American Heritage Partnership Act.

All of those rules were open rules except for the fact that they had time constraints. All of those rules were completely open except for time constraints, and the time constraints were no more than 4 hours, not 10 hours. We allowed those to go. We supported the gentleman, we in the minority, and allowed those to go through on voice votes, even though they were severe time constraints, because it was an open rule process.

We would certainly expect at least that kind of consideration from those in the minority.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, first, my understanding was last year votes did not come out of that time, so there was some control.

Second, I am, again, struck by every time the gentleman is questioned about living up to the promises that were made, the answer is "We are doing the same as you did." It seems to me that there ought to be a time limit on how often you can have it both ways. Either you are bringing a new openness to the House, or you are following the old rules.

Maybe the gentleman can decide 1 day it will be one and 1 day it will be the other, but there ought to be a rule you cannot make both arguments in the same day, so once again we get the argument "We are just doing what you did."

I do not think we always did what was right. As far as the gentleman agreeing to limit rules, let me be very clear. The minority last year, when they were in the minority, and before that, very often they supported closed rules whenever they did not want to see amendments. That is very clear.

However, the fact is that the open rule process as the gentleman describes it is anything but an open rule process, and maybe I hallucinated. Maybe the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] was not there a few minutes ago saying "I had an amendment that I was kept from offering." I could have sworn he was. I will have to check C-SPAN, because I do not think he could have been clipped out.

The fact is that Members here time and time again have been prevented from offering amendments. Again, I do not remember this situation where the rollcalls all came out of that, so people had an extended rollcalls. By the way, even if that is what we did, even if that is what we did, I think you should feel free to change it.

□ 1420

Please let me say to my friends on the other side. Do not feel bound by our example. If in fact experience has shown that people like the gentleman from Nebraska cannot offer an amendment, improve on us. Strive to be better. Do not limit yourselves by history.

At the same time, I have to say if the explanation is always going to be that you are just doing what we did, please stop insisting that you are doing it very different. The fact is that on issue after issue that has come up under your supposed open rule, we have not been able to get to amendments.

I would say one final thing as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary, under the gun, has done away with subcommittee markups. Maybe other committees have. We have not had extensive hearings. So in fact bills are coming to the floor under this period less prepared with less work than previously. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has time and time said, "Well, We'll make sure you can offer that amendment on the floor. I will fight for your right to offer the amendment on the floor." And because of this restrictive 10-hour provision, subject as it is to manipulation and abuse, that has not been the case. So we have hasty legislation without subcommittee markups rushed to the floor with previous questions ordered in committee and then the 10-hour rule which with all that comes out of it is rarely as much as 5 or 6 hours of genuine debate, and on issue after issue after issue fundamental amendments have not been allowed to be presented.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I can move on to next week's schedule.

On Monday, February 27, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will take up the rule for H.R. 1022, the Risk Assessment Cost Benefit Act

of 1995, and then move into debate on that legislation.

Members should take note that there will be no votes before 5 p.m. on Monday. I am sorry, there will be. Please, let me correct myself.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thought the gentleman was yielding in more ways than one.

Mr. ARMEY. You can call that a Freudian optimism if you like.

Mr. FAZIO of California. There have been several this year.

Mr. ARMEY. Members will take note there will be votes before 5 p.m. on Monday. However, we expect no votes before 3:30 p.m.

If the majority can be assured by the minority they will not call for a vote on the rule, the majority can certainly assure the minority that no vote will be called for on this side, in which case we can amend our advice to our Members regarding the time at which votes will take place.

On Tuesday, February 28, the House will meet at 9:30 a.m. for morning hour and at 11 a.m. for legislative business. We expect to complete consideration of H.R. 1022 and then possibly take up the rule for H.R. 926, the Regulatory Reform and Relief Act.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. and depending on the previous day's action, we will expect to complete consideration on H.R. 926.

On Thursday and Friday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider H.R. 925, the Private Property Protection Act of 1995, which is subject to a rule. We plan to complete consideration of H.R. 925 on Friday.

Also, we may take up House Resolution 80, the resolution of inquiry into the Mexican currency situation, on Thursday or Friday. It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families in their districts by 3 p.m. on Friday.

The House schedule for next week promises to be a very busy one and Members should be advised that we do expect to complete consideration on these important pieces of legislation next week. So the House may work late into the evening on several days.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the leader for yielding.

I guess I go back to this 3:30 votes issue. I personally think that Members from the West are being held hostage as we attempt to move the process here so quickly. We all understand that an open rule is being defined in a variety of ways and there are many Members on our side who object to the 10-hour time limit.

If there could be and I think there is a good chance for unanimous-consent requests to be granted, then perhaps we would be able to roll the vote on the rule until after 5 p.m. so that Members in the West can maintain their schedules and plan to fly as they had originally planned, can carry out their Sun-

day activities and still be here in time to vote against or for this rule as they may wish to.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I want to make a suggestion, since my friends on the other side have told us that our example is more important to them than I had previously realized. Let me give them one that they apparently overlooked in their study of us. We have in the past done rules in two parts. It would be entirely possible on a Monday to bring out a rule which provided for general debate. We could then have the rule voted unanimously, have the two hours of general debate, then go into the other part.

If you were in fact motivated by a desire to accommodate that point of view and not lose any time, you could have a two-part rule. You could have a rule that provided for general debate and then go into the other rule which would provide for debate beyond that. That is something we often did.

An agreement to do a two-part rule which puts general debate up in the noncontroversial procedure and then has a more controversial one would accommodate this.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from California makes a good point about the difficulties that the California and other western travelers have. The majority leader would like to extend to the gentleman from California the invitation, if you would like to make a unanimous-consent request that would allow us to roll the vote on the rule until the conclusion of general debate on the ensuing bill, I can assure you no one on this side of the aisle would object to that unanimous consent request.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman would yield, I would be inclined to make that request. I do want to make sure that I would not find opponents on my side. I am encouraged by your position and we can perhaps make such a request shortly.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I want to ask a couple of other questions, and we will have an answer to that question in just a moment.

Can the gentleman tell us when the resolution regarding the Mexico bailout situation will be brought up? Is it fair to say members would be given 24 hours' notice prior to its consideration?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct. I wish I could be more precise. It will be Thursday or Friday. But I can assure the gentleman that you will have 24 hours' notice.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Second, I want to reiterate our desire to be able at whatever time it can be made available to get a projection of when you think the other pieces of legislation in the contract may be

brought up. I realize that you do not know for sure. But it would help us a lot if we could have that projection so we can begin thinking about what is coming and when it is coming and provide for that.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, again let me thank you for your suggestion. We are again in a period where we are examining that schedule and we would hope to be able to give you that as soon as possible.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Finally, you have said that the House will meet at 10 a.m. Wednesday instead of 11.

I assume that you have the authority to effect this meeting time change. Traditionally as you know the minority has been consulted and agreed to changes in the meeting time. I would hope we could continue with that practice. I realize what your concern is. We will try to work with you in every way that we can. But it would be helpful if we could talk about that before it is announced.

Mr. ARMEY. Again if the gentleman would yield, let me say that I expect that we will work this out by unanimous consent. It is my anticipation that we will be able to do so.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Finally, can the gentleman tell at this point when the tax reduction bill along with the budget cuts to pay for it might be coming onto the floor? Generally, I know you do not know the exact date but just the general time.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, we expect that to be very late in March. We anticipate that being the last of the contract items to be brought to the floor. So at this point, let me just say very late in March.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman. I have no further questions. We will be getting an answer on this possible unanimous consent request on the rule on Monday. As soon as we have an answer, we will try to make that request if we can.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, I am optimistic that the request might be made. I am confident it will not be objected to on this side. Let me just point out that we will put a whip advisory out immediately and I am sure your side will do the same.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Exactly. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1430

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I was called away from the House floor on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, due to an emergency in my family and missed several votes.

Had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcall 152, "no" on

rollcall 153, "yes" on rollcall 154, "no" on rollcall 155, "no" on rollcall 156, and "yes" on rollcall 157.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a statement to this effect appear in the permanent RECORD following these votes.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT BY CUTS

(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 appreciate the opportunity to address the house this afternoon. I was so ecstatic this morning when I came in because I am only a second-term Member but I found out I had arrived. I found out that last night I was called by name on Rush Limbaugh, but the only thing he missed, he did not say I was GENE GREEN, he called me Mr. Green Jeans, and I am glad for that recognition even though he did transpose the names.

The reason he talked about it though was because I talked about how the breakfast and lunch program will cut children in Texas by 4 percent, and yesterday the House majority Republicans on the Economic and Educational Opportunity Committee voted to deny thousands of school children in the State of Texas their breakfast and their lunches.

Last year during the fall when people asked me what I thought a Republican majority would be in Congress I jokingly described it as nuclear winter. Well, if it is, then we are subjecting ourselves to the fallout now.

The Committee on Appropriations yesterday cut \$17 billion out of many programs.

Safe and Drug free schools cut by \$481 million.

School-to-Work cut by \$24 million.

Displaced Workers was cut by \$99 million.

In nondefense rescission bill this week job training was cut by \$200 million.

Veterans Administration will be cut by \$206 million.

NASA reduced by \$66 million.

Federal Highway Administration cut by \$421 million.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who was, by definition, a great American. Born into slavery in 1817, Frederick Douglass would become an abolitionist, orator, journalist, and advisor to Presidents.

Abraham Lincoln once told Frederick Douglass, "There is no man whose opinion I value more than yours."

His first autobiography paints a cruelly accurate picture of the conditions and circumstances he endured as part of his childhood. Nevertheless, Douglass learned to read and write at an early age, when the plantation owner's wife defied the law and began teaching him. This was the beginning of what would become an impressive self-education.

Eventually Douglass was put to work in a Baltimore shipyard. In 1838, Douglass escaped to New York and soon moved to New Bedford, MA, where he married.

Douglass soon became active within the Massachusetts abolitionist movement. After an impromptu speech at a rally in Nantucket, Douglass was immediately propelled to the forefront of the abolitionist debate then raging throughout America.

Many who heard Douglass speak began doubting his story. At the time,