

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand that. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is limited in the amount of time he can state the obvious. Yes, if you are a profit-making corporation and you are going about the business of trying to make a profit, this amendment does not protect you. You could be subject to RICO. I agree.

If General Motors was accused of trying to sell girl scout cookies in a racketeering way, you have come to their defense. But if someone said, corporation X is guilty of racketeering in its profit-making corporate entity, they are not protected. I do not think that ought to be the case. I do think there have been abuses of RICO, but against profit-making entities trying to make a profit. Indeed, if you look at the pattern of RICO, it is more often used by one civil plaintiff against a civil defendant and a profit-making corporation.

I do not know what play they are going to call in the huddle, but we may be about to see version five. I have four versions and seven people working on amendment 5.

Let us go to a hearing. Let us go to a markup. I do not think we should have the markup right here. It is not polite. I think we ought to do this in the regular order. But this amendment says, if you are engaging in profit-making activity, and you have a profit-making purpose, you get no benefit. You are covered by RICO.

RICO says you cannot get together for racketeering purposes. I would not suggest that that is what is going on over there, Mr. Chairman. What they are trying to do is what we should do in the regular legislative process. Let us have a hearing and do this in a sensible way.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the pertinent comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and would say that many of his comment are accurate, and that given his comments being accurate, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would look forward, as I think many on our side would, and I know the ranking member would, we would love to reexamine the RICO statute across the board and deal with abuses, and on that basis I thank the gentleman and we will be cooperative.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) that he has performed a signal service by bringing this matter to our attention. Yes, it is in the wake of a jury verdict and a court case that happened in Chicago, but he is highlighting a problem this Congress has wrestled with for years; namely, trying to make some sense out of the RICO statute.

There are abuses where it is applied where it was never intended to be applied. That is recognized by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and conservatives on this side. We need to look at RICO. And so if the gentleman is generous enough, and he has been, to withdraw his amendment, I pledge the Committee on the Judiciary will take a hard look at revising the RICO statute, hold hearings, working in a bipartisan way with the minority, and try to come up with a bill that does something substantive and correct what we all agree is an egregious flaw.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we may wind up invoking that great quote from Edward G. Robinson in the civil situation, "is this the end of RICO?"

Mr. HYDE. That is from Little Caesar, and I remember it well. The gentleman and I are the only two.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The amendment in the committee nature of a substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the Chair, Mr. ROGERS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1252) to modify the procedures of the Federal courts in certain matters, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 408, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the

Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1252.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1252, JUDICIAL REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1252, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 1252.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3579, 1998 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 3579, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to agree to funding for the International Monetary Fund consistent with the terms, conditions, and provisions of H.R. 3114, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.