

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1977 "Rule Defeated"	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open: waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(e) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open: waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive: provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 62% restrictive; 38% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to oppose this rule. It was said by the gentleman from California in his opening statement that this rule was here to rescue this important bill from Democratic tactics. Let me just say on last Thursday we had 14 amendments offered on the floor of the House, 8 of which were Republican amendments. The total time for Democratic debate on those amendments was 3½ hours. We spent over 2 hours just on the Gilchrest amendment alone, the Gilchrest amendment, which was to remove legislation from this appropriations bill dealing with the use of volunteers in the environmental field by the National Biological Survey.

So most of the time was in fact spent trying to figure out how to remove legislation that was unacceptable both to Republicans and to Democrats. But because of that debate, we now see that all of a sudden debate on this bill, on issues ranging from endangered species to the National Endowment for the Arts, are now collapsed into 20 minutes or 10 minutes on these most important issues.

This is clearly a gift to those who do not want to take the heat for the policy considerations that they want to have this bill enact. They do not want to take the heat for the changes in the law. If you can get this down so later tonight at 10 or 11 o'clock at night we are spending 10 minutes a side to debate these issues, then you can go on about your business.

It is the wrong way to legislate. The House deserves better, the members of the authorizing committees who are disenfranchised by this effort deserve better, and the American people deserve better about these kinds of major changes being presented to us now, in as restrictive a rule essentially as you can have, which is to offer you the minimum time per side as opposed to the minimum time you have under the 5-minute rule for the Members of the House, which is 5 minutes per Member

who can stand up and argue these debates.

□ 1730

That is open and free debate. This rule is not about open and free debate. This rule is about closing down debate so you do not have to answer the hard questions.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we did hear from my friend from Woodland Hills that there is support of this rule. I guess I am speaking for the leadership on both sides of the aisle in stating that there is strong support for this rule.

I hope that we can pass it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DREIER:
Page 2, line 13, insert the following after the period:

"Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the following amendments (identified by numerical designation pursuant to clause 5 of rule XXIII) shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent: the amendments numbered 11, 31, 40, 41, 57, 61, 65, 66, and 72. The amendment numbered 57 is hereby modified to insert on page 94 after line 24."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 15 minutes remaining on the amendment and the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening statement and in response to statements from the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], this amendment would simply permit the House to debate a specific group of 9 amendments for up to 20 minutes each, rather than the 10 minutes provided for under the pending rule.

Debate time on these amendments shall be equally divided and controlled between the proponent and an opponent. As the new rule already stipulates, the amendments shall be considered as read, are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying earlier, we are offering this amendment in a spirit of bipartisanship, recognizing that certain issues that are associated

with this bill, such as funding for the arts and humanities, deserve additional time on the floor for debate. As I have said, we have doubled the amount of time on that. This amendment was developed in close consultation and cooperation with the minority and I urge my colleagues to support this fair and straightforward amendment.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have no time over here. If we did, I would have recognized myself and would have joined in support of the amendment which we are pleased that the gentleman is offering. We ask for its support.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that I was very careful in maintaining time over here so that I would get those wonderful words from the distinguished minority manager of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until 6 p.m.

The point of no quorum is considered as withdrawn.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Resources.

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 California?

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, we have been advised that the Democratic leadership has been consulted and has no objection to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 6 p.m.

□ 1803

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) at 6:03 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the de novo vote on the passage of House Resolution 189, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

(For text of House Resolution 189, as amended, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1977, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other materials.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1977.

□ 1804

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHAYS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 12, 1995, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to House Resolution 189, further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed without intervening motion except amendments beginning in title II printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before July 14, 1995; motions that the committee rise offered by the majority leader or his designee, and motions that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted offered a preferential under clause 2(d) of rule XXI.

Each further amendment to the bill may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed, is considered read, is debatable for either 10 or 20 minutes, as the case may be, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BASS

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BASS: Page 47, line 25, insert before the period the following:

“: Provided: That the Forest Service shall make a priority emergency purchase of the Bretton Woods tract within the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this amendment is subject to a point of order and I plan to withdraw it shortly. However, I would like to enter into a very brief colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

Is this acceptable to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes, it is. We do object to the amendment, but I think the colloquy will clear that up.

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that certain funds will be available in this bill for emergency land acquisitions. These acquisitions include tracts of land which are surrounded by existing national forest land and are imminently threatened by development. It is my further understanding that the Bretton Woods tract in the White Mountain National Forest is the type of acquisition that might qualify for funding.

Is this also the understanding of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, it is. I would point out, as the gentleman did earlier, that the money in here only applies in the event of an emergency. This is the type of thing that might qualify.

Mr. BASS. Very well. I thank my colleague for his courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the acquisition of the Bretton Woods tract and its incorporation into the White Mountain National Forest. Historically, aesthetically, and recreationally, this 480-acre tract is invaluable to New Hampshire's North Country. This expanse is one of the last remaining undeveloped private ownerships that lies within the panorama of the historic Mt. Washington Hotel where the Bretton Woods Treaty was signed 50 years ago. The property contains over 10 miles of trails that provide the area's many visitors with outstanding recreational opportunities, including hiking, mountain biking, cross-country skiing, and snowmobiling.

The Forest Service has informed me that this tract's acquisition would qualify as an emergency. The land is surrounded on three sides by the national forest. While the land is zoned for development, the owner is ready to sell the parcel to the Forest Service. However,