I do not oppose this resolution on its merits. Peace, with congressional approval, is good. Military deployment, with congressional approval, is good. I oppose the resolution because of the process in which it is being considered. No hearings, no committee consideration, no adequate debate, or discussion.

Let us allow the negotiators to negotiate. If and when they are able to come to an agreement for peace in Bosnia, then let the Congress judge the merits of that settlement.

And in the meantime, let us process important business like this in a proper legislative fashion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 247.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 247.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–297) on the resolution (H. Res. 248) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House rule XX, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KASICH moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2491), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 1 hour on his motion.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have the right to yield blocks of time for purposes of debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if am I correct that will be five Republican and three Democratic conferees for all titles of the bill under current plans?

Mr. KASICH. The answer is yes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, in the case of other committees, in most cases, except for those issues relating to tax, trade, and Medicare and Medicaid, there will only be two majority and one minority conferee?

Mr. KASICH. In most cases that would be correct.

Mr. SABO. So, the agreement in those conferences would really be governed by the general conferees, the five Republicans and three Democrats, and then the two from that particular committee of the majority and one for the minority?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. So that in an area like agriculture, where we are doing a major rewrite of agriculture policy, there would be 11 conferees; and 3 of them, 2 majority and 1 minority, from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, in the case of agriculture, the Republicans would have three, the Democratic Party would have two.

Mr. SABO. Then that's changed recently?

Mr. KASICH. Correct.

Mr. SABO. But, Mr. Speaker, I would still be eight general conferees and only five from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. So, the general conferees, if they agreed, would outvote the Committee on Agriculture members 8 to 5?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would not anticipate that happening, but theoretically that would be possible.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, as I think everyone agrees, this is a major rewrite of agriculture policy in this country then being done by five members from that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I come to protest the composition of the conference and to object to going to conference.

Mr. Speaker, the word I had, up until the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] mentioned, was that we would have one conferee from the minority from the Committee on Agriculture. I am now informed that it would be two. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, there was a book written once by a great American called ''The Arrogance of Power.'' We are experiencing that at this precise moment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture debated and voted three times. None of the measures prevailed, therefore, the Committee on Agriculture did not submit a measure by a majority vote to the conference committee. But there is something called the Freedom to Farm Act that was then placed by either the Committee on the Budget or the Committee on Rules in the legislation without any contribution, debate, or participation of the Committee on Agriculture. It was done by the leadership; by the leadership of the Committee on the Budget and by the leadership of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I protest that move vehemently. I think it is an insult to American agriculture. I think it is an insult to the American consumers who are the ultimate recipients of the legislation enacted heretofore by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that this is not only demeaning but insulting, that a revamping of the farm legislation is being done with only two members of the minority in the Committee on Agriculture and that they would be outvoted, nonetheless, by non-Committee on Agriculture general members of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Department of Agriculture established by President Lincoln, this has not happened. In our bipartisan handling of legislation, my experience here has always been that we come up with a bipartisan approach, consensus approach to the legislation by which agriculture, to some extent rural America, and the consumers would be serving under or receive the benefit thereof.

Mr. speaker, I protest. I know that I have heard it for so many years from our colleagues on the other side that we do not have the votes, so all we can do is expose, Mr. Speaker, the damage that has been done that can be done, that damage that it will do to the legislative system. I think that it basically begins the erosion of this great institution called the House of Representatives, which we once called, and still call, the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, no longer will it be the people's House, but rather it will be by ad hoc committees at the whim of whoever is in the leadership. And if this is the way that we will act heretofore,