

leader, and that resolves around the rescission bill itself. The gentleman mentioned that two bills will be considered in the Rules Committee and brought to the floor. Does the gentleman expect these rules to be considered separately?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, as I pointed out, the Rules Committee has not yet met and decided that.

Mr. BONIOR. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee whether his intention is to consider these bills separately or together?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, as the distinguished majority leader has said, the Rules Committee has not met, but I will say to the gentleman that there is a probability that we will.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me just mention to my friends, one bill is an emergency bill and one is a nonemergency bill, and as the gentleman will recall vividly from his objections last year, the rules were changed to make it contrary to the new House rules to have these bills considered together and combined. So I hope we will stay with the rules and standards which you established for us during the last Congress and have implemented in the rules of this Congress.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield finally to any friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Majority Leader, if I could engage you for a moment, I want to point out to the majority leader that last week you and I had a colloquy. The gentleman observed that it was in our best interest to put me at home with my family as opposed to having me on the floor, and you know we agree on that, and I want to thank the gentleman.

I was speaking with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] as we went off the floor and I said see, just 1 week later and we have 3 days that we will be able to be with our families, so we thank the gentleman for that.

I would note, with my tongue just a little bit in my cheek, that this may bring out something that we have been trying to say all along, that when you remove items of the contract from consideration, like the term limits bill, that not bringing something up under the contract might truly be construed as family friendly.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to take up one other little matter with the floor leader, and just bring it to his attention, and I hope that in the future maybe we can work out a little bit better utilization of time than we have been.

This morning we had a limit of 10 1-minutes on each side. At the time we had a number, quite a few more here that wanted to make 1-minutes, including yours truly, and I do not know,

there were other Members of your party here also, but I do not know how many wanted to do 1-minutes. I did not go ask them.

□ 1300

But we are here now at 1 o'clock and everything, and I would hope that in the future Members would be able to give them. I appreciate it if the majority leader would recognize that this is an opportunity that many Members think is very worthwhile, to express themselves on an issue, and that by reducing that time unnecessarily it appears to some of us that you just do not want to hear us on the floor of the House, and I hope that that is not so. I would hope that, come like Monday, and Tuesday, there should not be any limit at all; come Wednesday, that we could have sufficient—at least 15 on each side, and then Thursday we will leave it up to you because you want to get out, and we all want to get out at 3 o'clock. But I would hope that we can have a little more favorable view of these 1-minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] that I would look forward to listening to him speak for as long as he wants. I am sure he could have a 1-hour prime time special order on Monday, and, if the gentleman takes that special order, I am sure I will find some time to listen to some part of it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I am not looking for the 1 hour for myself. I am looking for other Members that have been over here that have speeches ready to go and cannot give them because we have an artificial barrier of limiting the 1-minutes when some feel that it really is not necessary to limit it on certain days, and I would hope that the floor leader—I am not asking for an answer right now, but I hope he looks at it for the future and tries to assess it a little bit different.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we plan for a 3 o'clock departure for today. We had a couple of amendments withdrawn. We had a couple of others that were accepted, and we got a bonus because of the working relationship of the majority and minority Members on the floor, and, yes, it turns out, given that circumstance, that our need was not as we had thought it was, and I thank the gentleman for his point.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority leader a very pleasant and happy weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). The Chair would point out that additional 1-minute speeches are in order at this time.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY,
MARCH 14, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 13, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m., on Tuesday, March 14, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
MARCH 10, 1995, TO MONDAY,
MARCH 13, 1995

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

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.

PROVIDING FOR THE TRANSFER
OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEE POSI-
TIONS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for the transfer of certain employee positions and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That (a)(1) the two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the majority leader.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1988, as contained in section 101(i) of Public Law 100-202; and

(B) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990.

(b)(1) The two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the majority leader to the House Republican Conference.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and

(B) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by section 102(a)(4) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990;

both of which positions were transferred to the majority leader by House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) The two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to the minority leader.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) one of the two positions established by section 103(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1986; and

(B) the position established by section 102(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1988, as contained in section 101(i) of Public Law 100-202.

(b)(1) The two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the minority leader to the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established by section 102(a)(3) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990; and

(B) the position established by paragraph 2. (a) of House Resolution 690, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to January 26, 1966, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1967.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon the enactment of this section into permanent law, the amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect.

(b) Subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3) is amended by striking out "Chief majority whip" and inserting in lieu thereof "chief deputy majority whip".

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES' PLANS ON WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the Committee on Rules' plans for the welfare reform bill. For the information of the Members, the Committee on Ways and Means bill is H.R. 1157, the Committee on Economic Opportunity's bill is H.R. 999, and the Committee on Agriculture bill is H.R. 1135. It is the intention of the committee to make in order a new text reflecting the reported versions of the three major committees of jurisdiction. This text will be introduced as a new bill on Monday, March 13, that is this coming Monday, for draft and inspection purposes. Copies of the new bill can be obtained from the majority offices of the three committees that have reported this legislation around 3 p.m. on Mon-

day, even though the House may have adjourned by that time.

The Committee on Rules plans to meet late next week to grant a rule to provide for consideration of the welfare reform package.

The committee is contemplating a rule which would restrict the offering of amendments. Any Member contemplating an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Rules Committee no later than 5 p.m. Wednesday, March 15. Substitutes and free-standing amendments may be filed. No second-degree amendments will be allowed.

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 their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. On this bill, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for Members to expect to appear before the Committee on Rules and to furnish the Committee on Rules with copies of the amendments and not just print them in the RECORD?

Mr. SOLOMON. That is correct. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am glad to know that.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for reminding the membership.

TURN OFF O.J. AND WATCH MY SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am first up for a 1-hour special order, and it is one that I have been trying to do before my fellow Members in this esteemed body and that growing audience of 1,300,000 caring Americans across the country through the courtesy of C-SPAN, and it is going to be on the Battle of the Bulge. Fortunately, I was able to get over to Europe in December with the Secretary of the Army, and I was a little bit saddened that no Member of the other Chamber, of the United States Senate, or any other Member of the House was able to get over there on December 16, which was the beginning of the last major Army offensive move in the West of the war, and it took the lives of between 16,000 Americans killed in action, to 19,000, depending on when one determines what was the cutoff of this offensive, and it was fought in the dead of winter, under snow cover, and I hope that people will turn off O.J. Simpson's trial and watch this special order.

Mr. Speaker, this is what America is all about, remembering those who gave their lives for our freedom.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF JUDGE JAMES B. McMILLAN

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Judge James B. McMillan, a North Carolina stalwart, died Saturday, March 4. Judge McMillan lived just outside my district, but he had a tremendous impact on children in my district. I rise today in tribute to this great man.

Judge James McMillan will always be remembered for his courageous, and right, court decision which ordered the desegregation of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. This ruling forced a reluctant school system to move into the future. He did this despite the repeated threats to his life and his family, and the subsequent FBI protection that the McMillan family had to live with for years.

Judge McMillan should be remembered for his courage and for the impact he had on Charlotte-Mecklenburg and North Carolina. Today, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools are still among the Nation's most integrated schools. Charlotte, as a result, is viewed as a shining symbol of the South.

Because of Judge McMillan, North Carolina's children in 1970 received what they so rarely got: justice. Today's children receive the benefit of his wisdom, and live with more hope and opportunity. We mourn the passing of Judge James B. McMillan.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN FOR AMERICA'S CORPORATIONS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax plan announced yesterday takes us back to the days of yesteryear, when 130 of the 250 largest corporations in America paid no income taxes in spite of having profits of \$72 billion prior to 1986; 130 of these corporations paid no taxes in 1 or more years.

The Republicans are repealing the alternative minimum tax for corporations and, once again, these corporations will not have an obligation to the people of this country. As they shift the jobs overseas, they will pay no taxes in America.

Prior to 1986, Burlington Industries paid no taxes in 2 out of 4 years; Burlington Northern, 2 out of 4 years; Adolph Coors, 1 out of 5 years; Lockheed, 4 out of 5 years; Mitchell Energy, 4 out of 5 years; General Dynamics, 4 out of 5 years; the Grumman Corp., 4 out of 5 years paid no taxes, yet they earned \$72 billion.

Do Members want to know why middle-income taxpayers are paying more taxes? Because the Republicans are going to let the American corporations