

the additional requirements on agencies that Title II of this Act imposes. If, however, such underlying Federal statutes does not have a statute of limitations that is less than 180 days, then for review of agency rules under Section 706(1) that include the requirements set forth in Section 202 or Section 203(a) (1) and (2), the time for filing an action under Section 706(1) is limited to 180 days.

Finally, Section 401(b)(1) makes it clear that except as provided in Section 401(a), no other provision or requirement in the Act is subject to judicial review. Title I, those portions of Title II not expressly referenced above, and Title III are completely exempt from any judicial review. Section 401(b)(2) states that, except as provided in Section 401(a), the Act creates no right or benefit that can be enforced by any person in any action. Section 401(a)(6) states that any agency rule for which a general notice of proposed rulemaking has been promulgated after October 1, 1995 shall be subject to judicial review as provided in Section 401(a)(2) (A) and (B).

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
March 10, 1995.

Hon. DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KEMPTHORNE: Per our conversation of March 9, 1995, I am writing to confirm that in the counting of days in the U.S. Senate, a sine die adjournment will result in the beginning again of the day counting process and that the sine die adjournment of a Congress results in all legislative action being terminated and any process ended so that it must begin again in a new Congress.

Hoping this may be of help. I remain,
Sincerely,

ROBERT B. DOVE,
Parliamentarian, U.S. Senate.

WILLIAM F. CLINGER,
ROB PORTMAN,
DAVID DREIER,
TOM DAVIS,
GARY CONDIT,
CARDISS COLLINS,
EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
JOE MOAKLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
BILL ROTH,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
JOHN GLENN,
J.J. EXON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 5-minute special order granted to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] for Wednesday, March 15, 1995, be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). 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.

TERM LIMITS: BRING IT TO A VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about promises. The Republicans have not lived up to their promise with the American people. Today we were supported to vote on term limits and on the first day of this session, I introduce a term limits bill that mirrors the one passed in my home State of Oregon. Oregonians overwhelmingly support term limits, and the majority of Americans do, too, and by all of the talk by Republicans, you would think they supported term limits too. But apparently not so.

The leadership will not schedule a vote on term limits today because a lot of those people who campaigned on term limits have suddenly gotten squeamish now that they are in office. Our current Republican Speaker has served in Congress for 28 years. That is what I call a career.

By not voting on term limits today, Republicans are saying that maybe they don't care what their constituents want. Maybe they just want to stay in office.

Most of those Republicans who signed this Contract With America said they are proud of it and they keep saying so. That contract has been rushed through Congress. Most of the issues being voted on have never been scrutinized in a hearing or allowed full public comment. But Republicans don't seem to have any problem voting anyway on those very important issues.

For instance, when the contract called for slashing laws that protect our health and our environment, laws like clean air and clean water, they had no problem scheduling a vote. When the contract called for taking away the number of cops on the street, no problem then for scheduling a vote. When the contract calls for taking away the rights of women and children and seniors to get fair treatment when a company knowingly harms them, again, no problem scheduling a vote.

But I want to remind all of us that the contract also called for a vote on term limits. We were supposed to vote on that today and tomorrow, but guess what? That is a vote that affects Members of Congress.

Now, we are not talking about hurting women and seniors and children and the environment or civil rights, no, not when we talk about term limits. What we are talking about is Members of Congress, about their jobs, their power, their incomes. Now we are talking about something that actually affects us.

I think that that is outrageous. I think that the business of this Congress is to keep our promises, and the reason why the public has such a low regard for Congress is because lawmakers put their interest in front of their constituents.

I came to Congress to do a job, not to get a job. I came here to change the spending priorities of Congress, to protect a woman's right to choose and to make our streets safer for all our citizens and, when my work is done, I will go back to my farm in Hillsboro, OR.

It has been an honor and it is an honor to be a public servant and I am proud to keep the promise I made to my constituents. I am here to fight for them. But I am not here to make a career out of it. I call on the majority to be honest with the American people, bring up term limits for a vote now, today, or tomorrow.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Ms. FURSE. Yes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Your complaint today is we did not bring up the term limit votes today. Is there some doubt in your mind that it will be brought up during the first 100 days as was promised the American people?

Ms. FURSE. The vote was scheduled for today and tomorrow; and Thursday evening, at the very last moment, I received the word that we were not going to vote on term limits.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is there any doubt in your mind—our Contract With America said it would be within the first 100 days there would be a vote on this issue.

Ms. FURSE. It makes me very doubtful. It raises a strong doubt. Why have we been voting on things that hurt children and women and the environment and civil rights, like the fourth amendment?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So the gentlewoman has a doubt that the Republicans mean to bring this up to a vote. I would hope that the people that have that doubt, and if we do bring it up for a vote, that they will then understand the Republicans are keeping their pledge.

Ms. FURSE. I would hope they would keep their pledge on time. I would hope we would vote on this only issue that affects us as Members of Congress, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentlewoman answer one other question? When have the Democrats for the last 40 years had such a vote?

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

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

NOTABLE WOMEN OF HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to add to the gentleman from Oregon's concern before I go into what I wanted to talk about. I think her concern is a legitimate one, that for over 200 years of this Republic we have done without term limits, and we have now driven the American people to really want term limits, and yet we seem to be able to get everything else up on time. But we tend to want to play with the term limits legislation so that it won't really apply to us, so that everybody will get at least 20 more years in before they kick in. There are some games being played and I think she had a legitimate point.

But, Mr. Speaker, the reason I really come to the floor is to talk about women's history week because—actually it is a month, we get a whole month this year, and it should be a month because actually this is a year where we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of women having gotten the right to vote federally, so in this diamond jubilee, I think it is only right that we look back at some of the history that so many Americans really don't know.

I want to just quickly talk about three women this morning that I think all played very important roles that a lot of people don't know about.

First is Anne Hutchinson. Ann Hutchinson was born in 1591 in England. She was born during the reign of Elizabeth I. Her father was an Episcopalian minister and she migrated with her husband to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. She was very steeped in theology because she had grown up with it, and obviously it was not long before she came to loggerheads with the different leaders in the Massachusetts Bay Colony who really were not under free speech. They were only into free speech for themselves.

We as Americans talk about, first, free speech, and, second, freedom of religion, but let me tell you, the first guys that got off the boat were not for that. And it was this very courageous woman, with her husband standing beside her, and she had over 12 children to join her, that took up this cudgel, and she and their followers ended up moving outside of the Massachusetts Bay Colony after several very prolonged trials where they tried to try her for witchcraft and everything else.

They moved and they started the first colony in America that had freedom of religion and freedom of speech in it. So I think as we talk about that, we should remember where some of those ideas came from and came from early on.

Another woman that I would like to talk about that we don't mention, she was one of the very early women in America to become a doctor, Mary Edwards Walker. She was not the first, but one of the first, and she became a great friend of Ms. Bloomer of the Bloomer girls. People forget where the word "bloomer" came from; it came from the woman who came up with the idea that it was very difficult to wear

hoop skirts all the time and came up with these billowing bloomers.

Well, Dr. Edwards, or Dr. Walker became very, very involved in serving the Union Army in the fields, and when she used to come into Washington, DC; to get you in someplace, they would arrest her because she was not wearing proper attire. If you can remember the attire of the Civil War, you can certainly understand why if you were a woman doctor and you were out on the field treating patients, you were not running around in one of those big hoop skirts. And finally, the Congress gave her a special exemption so she could come into town and resupply and not be arrested because of the terrific, meritorious job that she was doing for Union soldiers.

I think that is another very interesting and heroic woman that we know very little about. Another woman that I think is very interesting is Bertha Palmer. How many people who grew up in Chicago know about Palmer House, and she was the spouse of the Palmer of Palmer House. She also, when she inherited his wealth, proceeded to double it before she died, which is no shabby task, but she was a very, very strong person for women's rights. And some of the very interesting things that she did was during the Columbus exhibition, when they were celebrating the 400th anniversary of Columbus finding America, she was on the board and she said, "Well, aren't we going to do anything about Queen Isabella who at least put up the money."

I mean, this woman had some respect for that and of course you could imagine what the old boys said. They said, "See, that is what happened, put a woman on the board, the next thing you know they are trying to take over everything," so she ended up having to form a woman's exhibition right alongside of it. It became very successful and actually it ended up in the black even though the other one ended up in the red.

So these are three mothers that I think we should think more about in this month and I hope we get to think about many more.

ON MEXICO BAILOUT

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

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my friends, in politics as in humor, timing is everything, and the timing of President Clinton's \$20 billion bailout of Mexico could not be worse. At the very moment, the American dollar is taking a beating in world currency markets. The Clinton administration is sparing no expense to shore up the Mexican peso.

In looking through some of the clips over the weekend, it seemed to me the

timing of what President Clinton is doing is everything. For on this House floor this week we will be voting on a rescission package that cuts benefits for veterans.

Now, how do the veterans feel about a rescission package that cuts the veterans at the same time we are shoring up the peso by giving \$20 billion to the exchange stabilization fund?

Let me also talk to you about what the chief economist at Lehman Brothers, Allen Sinai said: "The dollars' new all-time lows are being generated by the United States ties to Mexico and the panic flight right now of funds away from weak currency countries, Mexico, Canada, and the United States."

Need I remind the Members of this body that the exchange stabilization fund that is being tapped by the Clinton administration was set up explicitly to protect the value of the United States dollar, not the Mexican peso. Yet the administration has already disbursed \$3 billion from this fund to Mexico whose current political corruption saga contains more characters than a Tolstoy novel and is expecting to ship down the next \$7 billion by the end of June. And for those of my colleagues who didn't read the paper this morning, Mr. Salinas, the former President of Mexico, has left Mexico, and now intends to reside in Boston, MA, and be a consultant.

Mr. Speaker, James Madison wrote, "The House of Representatives alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of the Government. They, in a word, hold the purse."

My colleagues, what that means basically is Congress has to approve money that you spend. The administration can't take this kind of money from the American people without Congress approving.

So that is why I call on the rest of the Members of this House to allow a vote on congressional approval for any additional funds to Mexico and suspend further payment until all the questions are answered from the Leach letter that we approved in a House resolution here on the House floor.

I would like to conclude by reading a quote from a leading columnist in Mexico talking about the recent disruption in Mexico and the peso, and she said, "Two things happened to Mexico under Mr. Salinas. He made us believe in the Government of Mexico and he anesthetized us from the corruption. Now the new President has made us see the corruption, and the result is we don't believe in Government anymore."

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to allow us to vote on this matter and suspend all further payments, particularly in light of the fact that we have a rescission package coming on this House floor that is going to be \$17 billion, almost as much as the President intends to give to Mexico without congressional approval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].