

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1271, the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the last ruling of the Chair that the gentleman would not be permitted to present his concurrent resolution concerning the tax benefits accorded to Mr. Murdoch, what was the basis for the Chair's ruling? Is it that the majority has not consented to the presentation of this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speakers' guidelines shown in section 757 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair does not recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker could I take it up as a privileged motion at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not a privileged motion at this time?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, could the Speaker cite a rule why it is not considered as that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not properly presented a resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. If I understand the previous ruling of the Chair in response to my parliamentary inquiry, it was that this is a Speaker's guideline. It is not a rule; it is a guideline that the Speaker has himself applied to the rules. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is an exercise of the Speaker's power of recognition for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the chair.

Ms. WATERS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, if it is not a rule and you cannot cite a rule, and you are saying it is a prerogative of the Speaker, is it documented anywhere that the Speaker intended to handle his power in this way?

You may not be aware that the Speaker said that he is adamantly opposed to this tax giveaway to Mr. Murdoch, and that he wishes to do something about it. I do not think you should shut down that opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will cite the rule: Clause 2, rule

XIV, from which the guidelines have been determined.

Ms. WATERS. I am sorry?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The decision of the Chair denying recognition is not appealable.

Mr. DEUTSCH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Why is that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This a discretionary recognition on the part of the Chair. It is not appealable.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair receive the gentleman's concurrent resolution to put it in the RECORD at this point and see if we can get the Speaker to read it, and maybe we could bring it up tomorrow, get recognition, because we obviously cannot get over this discretionary hurdle that the Speaker has.

Could I ask unanimous consent that we put the concurrent resolution in the RECORD at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may introduce the resolution through the hopper.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think what the gentleman is requesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have some type of recognition in terms of the Speaker himself, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], to actually take a look at it. He has stated publicly that he supports taking out this provision, and we really want to give him the opportunity to do exactly that.

Mr. TIAHRT. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek approval to print the text of the resolution?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think in terms of the gentleman from Colorado, the request—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry would be since the gentleman in the Chair is the designee of the Speaker at this point, and this is all discretion from the Speaker, but I understand the gentleman in the Chair saying he does not have the Speaker's OK to exercise this discretion, could the gentleman in the Chair take the concurrent resolution and, A, put it in the RECORD, and B, see if we can get the Speaker's concurrence, so the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] could be recognized tomorrow to bring this up?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if I might—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek unanimous consent to insert the resolution into the RECORD?

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute on the resolution.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that this resolution which we have not seen is going to be printed in the RECORD as if it were condoned by the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Mr. DEUTSCH. And also, further, that we be able to speak for 1 minute to be able to explain the resolution.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. WATERS. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, if you do not have the power by which to grant unanimous consent, acting on the Speaker's behalf, how, then, do you have the power to grant the opportunity for this to be put in the RECORD and to be dealt with tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can entertain a unanimous-consent request at any time at the Chair's discretion.

Ms. WATERS. But then, Mr. Speaker, you are exercising the discretion of the Speaker, as I understand it, sir, but you do not have the power to exercise that discretion fully? There appears to be a contradiction here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has the power of recognition. The Chair chooses not to exercise it now, under the bipartisan guidelines as suggested earlier.

Mr. DEUTSCH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, was the objection of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] to the motion by the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]? Therefore, I believe I have the opportunity to seek to address the House for 1 minute, not the issue regarding the printing of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, it was the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] who asked for the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would stand corrected, but I believe the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] asked for that request, and it was actually slightly different, both the printing and the attempt to talk. It would actually be the first time this issue was ever discussed on the floor, so it might be an appropriate thing. It is a significant issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] have a request at this time?

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to address the House for 1 minute on this particular issue.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do we not have 5 minutes coming up now where everybody is going to get a turn to speak?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute speech requests.

Mr. TIAHRT. I object, Mr. Speaker. Let us go to the 5 minutes and continue the business of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

FURTHER REQUEST AND CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard, I think there was a misunderstanding of what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] was attempting to do. I think it would be very helpful, perhaps, if the Speaker would now recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and let him renew his unanimous-consent request. I think we can move along.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REMOVE PROVISION FOR SPECIAL TAX BREAK FOR RUPERT MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] renew his request?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes. I do, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, along with many Members, I believe, a sustainable one-third vote, a concurrent resolution to take out the provision that gives a special tax break to Rupert Murdoch for \$63 million. At a time when we are cutting back on student loans, student work programs, student lunch programs, to do a thing that is just sleazy, it looks sleazy, it smells sleazy, it walks sleazy, it talks sleazy, and it is sleazy, and it is just something that this House, the greatest deliberative body in the world, should not be part of.

We have the opportunity to correct our actions. I urge the House tomorrow, I urge the leadership of this body, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], specifically, who has said that he is against this particular provision, let him speak in deeds, not just words.

I do not think there is one person in the entire country that believes that Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN was the impetus. We know that is not how this process works. The Speaker's relationship with Mr. Murdoch is clearly something that has been well documented in the press. I urge the support of both parties with the concurrent resolution tomorrow.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 70 AND REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 70, and that the joint resolution be re-referred to the Committee on Resources.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on House Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is my understanding that the Minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have checked with the ranking members of each of those committees and subcommittees, and they have agreed to that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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 will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE TAX CUT PACKAGE IS GOOD FOR THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon because Americans are overtaxed. Because of this, I support my colleague Mr. ARCHER's bill to lower taxes.

There is a growing realization in this country that we cannot afford to operate on deficit budgets. We spend too much money primarily because we are involved, at the Federal level, in too many things. If we really want to control spending, we must come to grips with the fact that the Government is entirely too big. Day after day, special interest groups file through this city claiming that they understand the need to reduce Federal spending but that their program only costs a little relative to the size of the budget. This reminds me of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers' boast that progress is being made regarding the size of the national debt as it relates to the national economy, while the national debt gets larger and larger and larger. These interest groups, and some of my colleagues, are missing the point. Government is too big.

But the mindset that still has a formidable presence in Congress is to see how little in Federal spending we can get away with cutting. Oh, they say, the voters are really mad about the deficit and debt, so we'll have to cut some things, but maybe not too much. Even among Members who say they want a balanced budget, there seems to be a large group that isn't interested in cutting \$1 more than needed to do this.

The chief reason why there is resistance to cutting taxes, even among those who campaigned in favor of tax cuts, is that if you cut taxes, but are striving for a balanced budget, you have to cut spending that much more. The current argument against cutting taxes is that it is irresponsible to do so in the face of a \$5 trillion national debt. My response is this: We have this debt not because of the tax rate but because of this body's insatiable lust for spending. What is irresponsible is for