

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 gentlewoman 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.