

The Republican women are attempting to spruce up Mr. Dole gender-wise, but they have a good feminist point. Ordinarily, in a case like this, the Democratic women would be yelping, but there was only the occasional brave mutter. "This is beyond the pale," said Representative Nita Lowey of New York.

One female Democratic lawmaker explained: "If this were a Republican President and Dick Morris was helping an accused rapist, you know we would be screaming. But it's not worth picking a fight. We just want to win in '96."

So Democrats have suppressed their distress as Mr. Morris has helped the Clintons shape-shift—when Hillary Rodham Clinton told Larry King "There is no left wing of the Clinton White House," and when Mr. Clinton embraced the radical Wisconsin plan to abolish welfare.

Until yesterday, gay groups had fumed as the President slithered away from same-sex marriage. But the overly eager White House announcement yesterday that Mr. Clinton would sign a law denying Federal recognition for same-sex marriages if it ever reached his desk was too much. The Human Rights Campaign, the largest gay-rights group, accused the President of carving in to the right wing, and disinvited George Stephanopoulos as a dinner speaker.

So Bill Clinton is in the Army. He's against gay marriage. His adviser did work for an alleged rapist. He moves from the left wing to the right wing because what he really believes in is the West Wing.

#### CLINTON'S LATEST DISCRACEFUL DODGE

"It is disgraceful that while the rest of the nation is honoring our fallen heroes of military service this weekend, Bill Clinton is seeking shelter behind the military he once claimed to loath, in an attempt to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones," commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan, Chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel, after the announcement that Bill Clinton will use The Soldier's and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 as part of his legal defense before the United States Supreme Court.

On May 15, 1996, attorneys for President Clinton filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court seeking to delay the sexual harassment lawsuit filed by Paula Jones, a former Arkansas state employee under the supervision of then-Governor Bill Clinton.

Lawyers for Clinton contend that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 provides temporary protection from civil suits while the President is in office. This Act requires that civil litigation against members of the armed services be postponed while they are on active duty. According to his plea, "President Clinton here thus seeks relief similar to that which he may be entitled as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces."

However, the purpose of the Act is to allow the United States to fulfill the requirements of national defense, by enabling "persons in the military service . . ." to "devote their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation." Furthermore, this Act clearly states that only members of the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and officers of the Public Health Service when properly detailed, are eligible for such relief. This Act goes further in defining the term "military service" to include the period during which one enters "active service" and ends when one leaves "active service."

Under the Constitution, Bill Clinton is the civilian Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Founding Fathers wanted to enshrine the principle of civilian control of the military in the Constitution and did so by

making the President the civilian Commander in Chief.

"Bill Clinton has never been an active duty member of the military. In fact, in 1969, he dodged the draft and ran from his obligations to both his military and his country. And now as the civilian Commander in Chief, he mocks the honorable men and women who have given their lives to the protection of our great nation."

#### BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for granting me this time from his 1-hour special order.

There are several issues that I would like to speak about today. Perhaps there is one issue that I should begin with, because no one else seems to be speaking out, although I know that it is close to the hearts of both Republicans and Democrats here in the House of Representatives.

When we have our disagreements here in the House, one thing that we learn is that although we disagree, we do have some fundamental agreements that keep us together as Americans and that bind us to all of the American people. That is, we do believe in democracy. We do believe in freedom of speech. We do believe in these fundamentals that were fought for by George Washington, whose picture is on our wall here in the Chamber of the House.

We believe that we have a commitment to the world, a commitment to the world to stand for freedom because our forefathers were aided by people whose picture is also here on the wall in our Chamber, Lafayette, who came here to help us struggle for our freedom and independence over 200 years ago.

Basically he did so because he wanted to express a solidarity with the people of the United States, knowing that we would be the champions of freedom. By our very nature, our country is composed of people who come here from all corners of the world, all parts of the world, every race, every religion, every ethnic group is represented here, and we live together in freedom and democracy. By that very nature, we owe the world something. That is the stay true to those principles of freedom and democracy that our forefathers proclaimed, not just the rights of Americans but the rights of all people.

In the last 48 hours, there has been a vicious attack on the cause of democracy in the country of Burma. Burma is a country you do not hear much about. Most Americans in fact probably think that Burma, the only thing they relate to is BurmaShave, they think of BurmaShave. It must be some sort of shaving cream or something.

In fact, Burma is a country with 48 million people in Southeast Asia. A

country that now is suffering under the heel of one of the world's most vicious dictatorships. And over these last few years, many of us who have been active in the human rights movement have tried to work and do our best to see that perhaps Burma could evolve out of this dictatorship. The military dictatorship in Burma is called SLORC. It is a name that basically fits the regime because it sounds like it is right out of "Star Wars," out of the monstrous regimes that the freedom fighters in the film series "Star Wars," where the freedom fighters are fighting against the evil empire.

This evil empire in Burma is repressing the people. But there is, you might say, a champion of freedom, a hero to the world who lives in Burma and has tried to bring democracy to that country. It is Aung San Suu Kyi. Aung San Suu Kyi was of course of Nobel prize winner 2 years ago. She has suffered 5 years of confinement. She was arrested by the SLORC regime. Then last year she was set free and many of us hoped that there would be lessening of the repression in Burma. But what has happened in the last 48 hours is that the military dictatorship in Burma, SLORC, has rounded up almost 200 members of the democratic opposition in Burma and arrested them.

Anyone who is meeting with Aung San Suu Kyi, anyone who is involved in the democratic movement is being arrested. Dr. Sein Win, the Prime Minister of the democratic government in exile, testified in the Senate yesterday that the situation in Burma is one of despair and despotism. Today his brother, who is not even a member of the democratic movement, was arrested in retaliation for what Prime Minister Sein Win testified about here in Washington.

□ 1700

So I have introduced a piece of legislation hopefully that will discourage Americans from doing business in Burma. It is H.R. 2892, and we would hope that the American people and American businessmen recognize that here is a country that if anywhere we should take a stand for freedom. If anywhere in the world we could take a stand and it will not hurt us and we just show that we believe in freedom, it could be Burma. And there is no excuse for us not to do so. There is no strategic interest there, there is no huge commercial interest, but what is there are 48 million people suffering under the heel of despotism, crying out to the United States for us to take a stand.

Take your stand, America. What side are you on?

When that cry goes out from people who are being oppressed, never should we say we are on the side of the dictators, we are on the side of the oppressors.

This country, this dictatorship in Burma, has financed its war on its own people by selling off its teak forests, which have been decimated, by basically selling its natural resources, its

gems, to foreigners who have come in and extracted it, and they put the money, the SLORC has put the money into their own pockets and into their own coffers, and now it is even willing to sell its natural gas resources to American companies. And where do these moneys go? They go into the purchase of weapon systems of military equipment and militarization of this country that is used to repress their own people.

Furthermore, this monstrous regime that represses its own people in Burma has taken its resources also by becoming involved in the drug trade. Many people in our country wanted us to actually cooperate with the Government of Burma, with its dictatorship, thinking that we could together stand against drugs.

Others of us believed, as I think has been reconfirmed, that the dictatorship in Burma is up to their necks in the drug trade. They have not refrained from becoming involved in growing opium and selling heroin because of some kind of morality. If they had any morality, they would not be murdering their own people, and that was brought home more recently when the drug lord Kung Saw, who was famous in the United States, or I should say infamous in the United States, he was put out of business by the Burmese military dictatorship, and what has happened? Kung Saw, he may have gone into retirement; of course he is not in jail, he is in retirement in Rangoon; but the drug trade and the drug production from his area, which is now under government control, continues at the level that it was.

Aung San Suu Kyi, this heroine of freedom, this woman who in our time shows an example to the world of what we should be like as Americans, champions of freedom, has asked us to put economic sanctions on this regime because it now has shown its true colors. It does not, the Burmese regime, the SLORC regime, does not want reform. It instead is seeking further repression and will grasp on to power until the last desperate time, what they have, is gone, until they are forced from power by pressure from the outside or by perhaps revolution from their own people. Unfortunately the SLORC regime is being bolstered by a military that is being supplied by Communist China. Communist China has sold Burma the weapons it needs to maintain a dictatorship.

In fact, Burma, is becoming a client state of China. The Red Chinese regime is doing all it can to keep its buddies, its gangster buddies, in power in Rangoon.

Congress will soon take up the issue, interestingly enough, of most-favored-nation status to China. This is an important piece of legislation. But let us make sure that, as we move forward when we are talking about Burma, that we can make a stand in Burma, and I, as I say, I have introduced H.R. 2892, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join

me in basically outlawing any further American investment through supporting H.R. 2892 and opposing any further American investment in Burma.

Now, we will make another choice very soon, too, which it comes to most-favored-nation status with China. When it comes to this decision, yes, there are a lot of other factors at play. There are many. China, Communist China, is a strategic country. There are a billion people in China. China has technologies. China has a huge army that can affect the United States. And also economically we are already in an economic relationship that in some way binds us to that country.

But just today it was disclosed that Chinese officials themselves have been involved with smuggling fully automatic AK-47 rifles into the United States. These are people that have contacts in the Chinese army. These are not Chinese entrepreneurs, people doing this outside of their own government. These are government officials themselves.

The Red Chinese regime is a rogue regime. It is oppressing its own people just like in Burma and every other dictatorship, but the regime also sells nuclear weapons technology to developing countries and arms dictatorships like Burma. It has a Nazi-like policy in dealing with orphans, in dealing with the disabled and dealing with the unborn.

It is conducting an economic war against the United States. I mean the bottom line is American companies find it difficult to sell in China unless the Chinese regime permits them to sell their goods there, yet they take full advantage of our market in the United States. So they limit access to their market, and they end up stealing our intellectual property, as is becoming known now. These people are involved with grand theft of our intellectual property rights, our CD's, our entertainment items that are worth billions of dollars to the economy of southern California; they are being ripped off by companies that are owned by the People's Liberation Army, by government officials in China.

They have, in fact, a \$35 billion trade surplus with us that does not even count the rip-offs, and with this \$35 billion in surplus, they buy weapons in order to upgrade their military, to threaten their neighbors, and bully their neighbors and to become a, quote, power in the world. Well, we have seen what that power means. What it means when you have a dictatorship spending money and upgrading its military, it means that it threatens its neighbors even more aggressively.

In the Philippines they know what a better armed China means. They have recently had a little confrontation with the Chinese over the Spratley Islands, and what should have been a negotiated disagreement became almost an armed confrontation when a belligerent, hostile and a threatening Red China decided it would have its way,

negotiations were not the order of the day.

We also saw the results of this when just a month ago the Red Chinese regime sent its military into the Taiwan Strait in an attempt to intimidate the democratic government, the Republic of China, Taiwan, trying to intimidate them into not having a free election. What we saw were missiles being fired at a democratic people, people who were simply trying to have an election, in order to intimidate them and frighten them from their democratic rights.

Well, what more, what more I ask you, does a country have to do before the United States says that they will not enjoy the trading status of most-favored-nation status with the United States? What more can a regime do? Do they have to open up gas ovens and begin murdering people exactly like the Nazis did during World War II?

This is a regime, a monster regime, on the mainland of China, and this administration, the Clinton administration, has decoupled any consideration of human rights to the consideration of most-favored-nation status for that regime. It is a disgrace. Let us remember that President Clinton 4 years ago was attacking then sitting President Bush for granting most-favored-nation status to the mainland Chinese regime, and as soon as President Clinton became President, not only did he grant most-favored-nation status, but he has decoupled the consideration of most-favored-nation status from any discussion about human rights. It is the ultimate hypocrisy and has been one of the biggest and worst setbacks for the human rights community in the U.S. history, when the President, when President Clinton, not only reneged but did an absolutely turnabout in his belief in supporting human rights on mainland China.

Well, who is it up to, then? It is up to us, the American people, to stand for our beliefs in freedom and democracy and to stand up, yes, for the interests of the United States, and what is happening with the most-favored-nation status debate here in Congress is that we find that those companies that are making a profit from their investment in China, a huge profit from their investment in China, have turned around and become lobbyists to us for this dictatorial regime. What we have found is not that what the theory was was that if we permit our people to invest in China they will become emissaries of democracy to that country, but they have instead become lobbyists for a dictatorship to the United States.

Well, we are the ones who have to make the decision, not just based on what a very small group of companies are doing, making a profit by dealing with these terribly dictatorial regimes whose hands are dripping with blood.

The fact is that when it comes to Burma, we have a right also to tell our people this is not the right thing to do,

for your to do, to invest in that dictatorship. We also have a right and obligation to our own people to say we will not permit Chinese goods that are produced in slave labor camps and produced by the army, buy companies that are owned by the army, and produced by a regime that is trying to bolster its weapon systems to threaten its neighbors, we will not permit that country to come into our marketplace and with the same status of other free and democratic countries.

I would hope that the American people insist that their representatives in the United States vote against most-favored-nation status for China.

There is one other issue that will be coming forth very quickly and that we will find in front of this body within the next 2 weeks. It is an issue that relates to most-favored-nation status and relates to these dictatorships around the world because it is changing our patent system in a way that will permit those thieves, those dictatorships around the world, to steal American technology.

Now, most of you probably have not heard anything about the proposed changes in our patent law. Most Americans would not even understand the proposed changes in our patent law. But there is an insidious attempt being made to make fundamental changes in the situation of our patent system, in the makeup of our patent system, so that it will be easier for foreign corporations to steal America's greatest asset, and that is the genius of our people. What will be coming forth before this body is a bill, H.R. 3460, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act. This act, believe it or not, will insist that from now on, if an American inventor applies for a patent in this country, after 18 months, whether or not that patent has been issued, that American inventor's application with all the details of the technology that he has developed will be published for the world to see. This is an invitation to the thieves of the world to steal our most precious asset, and that is the innovative and creative ideas of our inventors and our technology that we will use in the future to keep America competitive.

This is absolutely the greatest threat that I see to America's future prosperity, yet so few people will understand what the vote is all about. But it does not take a genius, however, to understand that if we disclose the information of our inventors, even before their patents have been issued, that there will be a line at the Patent Office to get that information and to fax it immediately to the Chinese mainland, where they will set up manufacturing units based on those ideas and that technology even before our inventors are issued their own patent.

Ironically, when H.R. 3460, the "Steal American Technologies Act," was going through the subcommittee, and it has passed the subcommittee in this body and is heading for the floor, on

the day that it was passed in the subcommittee I had a representative of an American company that represents many patents. It happens to be a solar energy company. He was there in my office, and we were discussing the patent law.

□ 1715

I asked him what would happen if his patent applications had been published before he actually was issued the patent. His face turned white, and his fists came together, and he said,

Congressman, if my patent applications are published before my patent is issued my foreign competitors will be actually manufacturing the things that I have invented before I can even go into manufacturing them. And do you know what they will do if I try to sue them later? They will use the profits from my own technology to fight me in court and wipe me out.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great threat to American prosperity. Every American should contact their Member of Congress, their Senator, to defeat H.R. 3460, the steal American technologies act. But this is only one, just one swing at the American patent system. The American patent system has been under attack, but because it is so hard to understand, the American people cannot see what is going on.

Another part of this very same bill would corporatize the Patent Office of the United States. People will say, DANA ROHRBACHER is a conservative Republican. Does he not believe in privatization? I certainly do not believe we should take our court system and the court functions of government and privatize them. No, there are certain things government has to do. Those things deal with protecting our rights, protecting our freedom, especially defining the property rights we have in a free society.

Part of this legislation would take the Patent Office and corporatize it and turn it into something like the Post Office. That may sound benign but, in effect, that would take patent examiners who today are making decisions, responsible decisions for what are the property rights dealing with new technology in our society, as to who owns those ideas and those new property rights that are being created, and those patent examiners by that process will be stripped of their civil service protection.

They will be then put in jeopardy of many outside forces, and even inside forces that might want to influence their decision, forces that have been thwarted up until now because patent examiners know their job is to make the right decision, and they are protected from people making assaults on them or trying to influence them from the outside.

Can anyone believe that stripping our patent examiners, the people who will define what is American technology in the future and who owns it, stripping them of their civil service protection, is not going to open the doorway to corruption, open the door-

way to foreigners coming here trying to steal our technology, and cut off our people from the rights to control their own inventions? Does anyone believe that that will not happen?

No one who looks at the issue believes that, but the fact is most of the Members of Congress will never have any way of seeing the details. They will be told some local company has decided that H.R. 3460, which I call the steal American technologies act, is a good thing because many American companies, what has happened, these big corporations, many of them who are now owned by multinational corporations and outside people, have big shares in those companies; but these big American corporations have decided that they are going to buy into global protection of America's intellectual property.

What it is, basically they have decided that for a promise from other countries like Red China, like Japan, and like many other developing countries, a promise from those countries, oh, yes, we will protect our intellectual property rights if you will only conform your system to be like our system. The changes that are brought about by H.R. 3460 are basically aimed at what they call harmonizing our law with that of Japan. We will blink our eyes and in a very short time period, we will see the patent law in the United States totally changed so that it mirrors that which Japan has had over these last few decades.

Mr. Speaker, it is very hard for people to understand what the significance of this is. Why is the gentleman from California, DANA ROHRBACHER, down here on the floor talking about patent law, these little changes? So what if it is going to harmonize with Japan?

Do we really want to walk around like ants, like the people of Japan? Do we want to be suppressed by the business interests, by the big boys that run roughshod over the people in Japan? How many new innovations and how much creativity has come out of Japan in these last 20 years? The people of Japan allow themselves, because they have a different culture, allow themselves to be dominated by big interest groups who control their society.

That is not what America is all about. America is about the rights of the individual, the rights of the little guy, the rights of every person to have the same control over his destiny as those people who are more affluent, the rights of every person to direct the course of his Government. Other countries are not this way.

But what we have here coming before this body is a stark choice: H.R. 3460, the steal American technologies act, versus a bill that I have put forward and tried to get to the floor of this body for 1½ years, H.R. 359. H.R. 359 would protect American inventors, and it would restore to American inventors the guaranteed patent right that they have to protect their invention or their idea for a guaranteed patent term of 17

years after they have been issued a patent.

Most Americans do not understand, and I am sad to report to those people who are listening tonight that the guaranteed patent term that Americans enjoyed for over 130 years has already been taken away from them, and most Americans do not even know it.

What happened is a year and a half ago, in the GATT implementation legislation, an item was snuck into this legislation that had nothing to do with the GATT agreement. It was not required by GATT but it was snuck in there, so that we as a body would have to vote against the entire world trading system, or we would have to vote for the world trading system. We would have to vote against the world trading system in order to get at that one provision.

Most Members, of course, were not willing to cut us off from all of the trade regulations of the GATT negotiations. But it was an insult to this body that they had put this provision in in the first place. What did this small provision do, this one little item that they snuck in there? There was an innocuous change in the patent law. It said that the patents now in the United States will now be measured from 20 years from the time the inventor files for the patent. So, 20 years later he will no longer have any patent rights.

It almost sounds like, hey, we are actually expanding the amount of time that a patent applicant has for the protection of his patent. But in reality what has happened, what we used to have is that if someone applies for a patent and it took 5 or 10 years for his patent application to be processed, he or she would have 17 years guaranteed patent protection time in order to make that investment back, in order to profit from that technology. But if we started at 20 years and it is over, if we started when the man applied for the patent and it is over in 20 years, if it takes 10 or 15 years for the patent to issue, that patent is almost worthless by the time it is issued. The fact is that three-quarters of the time has already been used up. In other words, the clock is ticking against the individual, rather than ticking against the bureaucracy.

That was a dramatic change, to let us harmonize our system with Japan. Mr. Speaker, it seems innocuous, but in the end, it dramatically affects the production of technology in our society, and it also, interestingly enough, affects who receives the benefits of that technology, because if a foreign corporation then only has to pay 5 years' worth of royalties, rather than 17 years, where is that money going?

That money that used to be going into the pockets of American inventors, because they had a guaranteed 17 years of patent protection, ends up staying right in the coffers of some big corporation in China or Japan or Korea, or even here in the United States. The little guy ends up losing

dramatically. The big guys end up being able to steal legally. They have changed the rules of the game.

My bill, H.R. 359, which will serve as a substitute for H.R. 3460, will return the patent rights that the American people lost by the GATT implementation legislation. So we will face a battle in the upcoming weeks between H.R. 3460, which is, as I say, I call it the steal American technologies act, versus my bill, H.R. 359.

I believe this issue deserves to be debated, because it has an impact not only on the people of the United States, but elsewhere. We should not permit countries like Red China to steal American technology and legally do so because we are disclosing our very utmost secrets to them by passing such foolish legislation. When it comes to most-favored-nation status, when there is a dictatorship like Red China or Burma, we should not treat them as any other free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe in free trade. I believe that commerce between free people is to the benefit of all free people. But let us as a country stand not for trade with dictators, but instead, let us stand for free trade between free people.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and Wednesday, May 29, on account of official business.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, after 2 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. WARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLOMON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on May 24.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and to include therein extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$5,185.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 60 of the 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Wednesday, May 29, 1996.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 29, 1996, at 2 p.m.

#### NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,  
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 304(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. §1384(b)), I am transmitting on behalf of the Board of Directors the enclosed notice of proposed rulemaking for publication in the Congressional Record. The notice, which the Board has approved, is being issued pursuant to §220(e).

The Congressional Accountability Act specifies that the enclosed notice be published on the first day on which both Houses are in session following this transmittal.

Sincerely,

GLEN D. NAGER,  
Chair of the Board.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Extension of Rights, Protections and Responsibilities Under Chapter 71 of Title 5, United States Code, Relating to Federal Service Labor-Management Relations (Regulations under section 220(e) of the Congressional Accountability Act).

#### NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Summary: The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is publishing proposed regulations to implement section 220 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA" or "Act"), Pub. L. 104-1, 109 Stat. 3. Specifically, these proposed regulations are published pursuant to section 220(e) of the CAA.

The provisions of section 220 are generally effective October 1, 1996. 2 U.S.C. section 1351. However, as to covered employees of certain specified employing offices, the rights and protections of section 220 will be effective on the effective date of Board regulations authorized under section 220(e). 2 U.S.C. section 1351(f).

The proposed regulations set forth herein, which are published under section 220(e) of the Act, are to be applied to certain employing offices of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Congressional instrumentalities and employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Congressional instrumentalities. These regulations set forth the recommendations of the Deputy