Nicholson is right now in Cuba. Not only did he arrive there and apparently demonstrate his intention to violate U.S. law, but he called, according to the press reports that I read this morning, Castro's Cuba a ''paradise.''

I would recommend to Mr. Nicholson, or to the President of Colombia, the gentleman whose visa has been denied to enter the United States because of allegations that he received money from the narcotraffickers in his campaign for President 4 years ago, I would recommend that both of them in the so-called paradise as described by Mr. Nicholson, that they seek to visit some of the political prisons, some of the prisons, of the hundreds of prisons in Cuba while they are staying in the so-called paradise.

There are, just to pick four examples, perhaps the most well-known of the leaders of the internal opposition in Cuba, the dissidents, are in dungeons in that paradise, according to Mr. Jack Nicholson. The dictator in Cuba, who has kept them there since July of 1997, the four most well-known leaders of the internal opposition in Cuba, has kept them in that dungeon, by the way, for the crime of publishing a document entitled ''The Homeland Belongs To All'' in which they call for free elections and a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. The Cuban dictator has not even decided yet what to charge them with. That is the so-called paradise, according to Mr. Nicholson.

So I would urge these millionaire visitors who go to the apartheid economy of Castro and partake of the pleasures available due to the slavery of the Cuban people, and when they call that so-called workers' paradise, as Nicholson did, a paradise, that they ask to visit the political prisons, or perhaps the widows or the orphans of the tens of thousands of victims of that so-called paradise.

It is shameful to see the attitude of these Jack Nicholsons of the world, the rich who believe they have no limits and who now go to the so-called workers' paradise only 90 miles from our shores to partake of the forbidden apple in all of its pleasures. It is sickening. It shows really the ugliest side of our free enterprise system, that some of these people with no conscience and no sensitivity would go and make statements like that and violate our laws and not be concerned about for 40 years the lack of the most elemental freedoms, the lack of democracy, and call a place like that totalitarian nightmare a paradise.

And so shame upon people like Nicholson. And also the President with the campaign contributions from the narcotraffickers. Obviously he feels comfortable in the land of a head of the narcotraffickers, the Cuban dictator.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2676, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING AND REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 490 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 490

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2676) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and reform the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Dayton, OH (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material).

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, this rule is needed to waive points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2676, the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act. This legislation is the culmination of years of dedicated effort and hard work by my colleague from Cincinnati, OH (Mr. PORTMAN) and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

Before outlining the historic nature of the conference report this rule would make in order, I first want to applaud the gentleman from Texas for his tenacity in overcoming the Clinton administration's opposition to bringing some badly needed sanity to the tax code. I am referring, of course, to the provision to roll back the absurd 18-month capital gains holding period that the President insisted on in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. That extra holding period turned the Schedule D form into the Rubik's Cube of tax forms, frustrating millions of families with unnecessary recordkeeping and complexity and also making it difficult for honest taxpayers to comply with the law.

□ 1045

Thanks to the inclusion, Madam Speaker, of the Archer rollback provision in this conference report, millions of American families will no longer have to endure endless hours of mindless calculations to complete that Schedule D.

But there are other benefits to the rollback as well.

Notwithstanding the static revenue estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Federal Government and State governments will see an increase in revenues from the effect of investors unlocking what heretofore has been unproductive capital. The unlocking effect from the reduction in the capital gains tax rate to 20 percent is primarily responsible for this year's budget surplus. Also, as our economy is further buffeted by the effects of the Asian economic crisis, streamlining the capital gains holding period will boost investment, capital formation and economic growth. And I will say parenthetically that I am very pleased that the Speaker has introduced legislation to take that top rate down to 15 percent. Nearly 170 of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, joined in the first session of the 105th Congress to get it to 14 percent.

So, we are headed in the right direction.

As I mentioned, this is a historic bill that will bring about the first comprehensive reform of the IRS in four decades. It will make the IRS more user friendly by, among other things, establishing an independent governing board and shifting the burden of proof from the taxpayer to the IRS in disputes that reach Tax Court. These reforms will make the IRS more accountable to the American people. They will enhance the fairness of the tax collection process by giving the taxpayer the benefit of the doubt when he or she has cooperated with the IRS and has documented evidence of compliance.

These reforms will not solve the more intractable problems brought on by a complicated and inefficient Tax Code. The solutions to those broader problems require comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code itself, which I hope the House will address next year. But the reforms contained in H.R. 2676 will go a long way toward protecting the right of taxpayers, making the IRS more accountable and restoring public confidence in the way the IRS enforces our tax laws.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding me the time.

As my colleague described, this is a rule for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2676. This is a bill to restructure the Internal Revenue Service. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. This bill will transform the agency into a more customer-service-oriented operation that resolves taxpayers' problems right away instead of letting problems drag on.

I want to point out to my colleagues that the IRS has already taken steps to

improve service in advance of this bill. For example, it has expanded telephone assistance, it has instituted nationwide problem-solving days, it strengthened the Office of the Taxpayer Advocate and has increased accountability for IRS management.

The legislation also directs the IRS commissioner to simplify the current complicated IRS structure and replace it with a new organization that will better serve taxpayers. This is a goal which is shared by the commissioner.

I regret that the conferees inserted provisions in the conference report that do not belong and, in my opinion, are unwise.

I am particularly concerned about the provision that changes the name of ''most-favored-nation'' trading status to ''normal trade'' relations. This name change is more than just symbolism. It is a prelude to a fundamental shift in the way we set our trading policies.

Madam Speaker, most-favored-nation trading status is earned by our trading partners. It is a reward for nations that have policies we can support. It can be denied to countries that do not conform, do not conform to our high standards such as those with a record of extreme human rights violations.

Changing the name is part of an effort to reduce the use of trade status as a tool of diplomacy especially to combat human rights abuses. If we change the name to ''normal trade'' relations, the implication is that all countries are entitled to this status.

The term ''most-favored-nation'' goes back to the 18th century. It has been used throughout the history of the United States and by our trading partners. It has worked well and should not be changed.

When the Committee on Rules considered the rule, I offered a motion to delete this section. Despite some support I received in the committee, and I appreciate that support, my amendment did fail.

I will not oppose the rule and risk delaying the legislation which is important to the American people. However, I remain opposed to the MFN provision in the manner in which it is being forced upon the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding this time to me. I rise, unfortunately, I rise in opposition to the rule on a bill that I had hoped to come to the floor to support today, and I do say I regretfully oppose this rule for the following reason:

There has been a good deal of debate about trade with China in this Congress. But I really did not think we would be having any today as the President starts his trip. I have myself refrained from speaking on this floor about that issue, as I say, while our President is in China. But then I found out that the Committee on Ways and Means had sneaked this provision into this bill. When I had spoken to members of the committee, they said, ''No, it's not in there; I've read the entire bill, it's not in there.'' But upon further investigation it was learned that changing the name of ''most favored nation'' status to ''normal trade'' status was put into this bill.

I can understand why my colleagues would not want to face up to this, because it is not right, and they must be ashamed of what they are doing or else they would let this decision be faced by this Congress standing on its own in the full light of day. But, my colleagues, you can call it whatever we want. It is not a rose, so I will not say a rose by any other name is still a rose because it is more like a thorn, a thorn in the side of the American worker.

I have here the chart about the trade deficits with the People's Republic of China, and if I continued this chart to 1998, my colleagues would see that in the years of the Clinton administration alone, by the end of 1998, the trade deficit with China will be about a quarter of a trillion dollars. That is not million with an M, billion with a B, it is TR, trillion dollars, and that trade deficit continues to grow.

Our colleagues boast that China buys nearly $13 billion from us, and that that number has increased. At the same time, the Chinese exports to the United States have grown to $62 billion for 1997, will be close to $80 billion for 1998, resulting in a trade deficit projected for 1998 of about over $63 billion.

In addition to the high tariffs which block access to most products made in America to the Chinese market, China has engaged in other nontariff barriers to our products. Let us talk about the tariffs for a moment. And do not take my word for it. This is the Foreign Trade Barriers Report of the U.S. Trade Representative's Office. It is the 1998 National Trade Estimate Report, and in it the trade rep says China restricts imports through a variety of means including high tariffs and taxes, nontariff measures and limitations on which enterprises can import, and other barriers. For example, China has used prohibitively high tariffs which in late 1997 still reached as high as 100 percent on some motor vehicles.

In the interests of time I will not read all of that, but just to conclude on that point, I say that these nominal high tariff rates to which China adds applicable value-added taxes on some goods, consumption taxes contribute to inefficiencies in China's economy pose a major threat to U.S. commercial opportunities.

I would not be opposed to most favored-nation-status for China if China extended it to the United States. In addition, in terms of service barriers, while China has promised to liberalize access, restrictive investment laws, lack of transparency and arbitrary application of regulations and laws limit U.S. service imports, exports and investments in China. My colleagues can read for themselves more and more about that in here.

Since Tiananmen Square in 1998, the trade deficit has soared from $3 billion at that time to a projected $63 billion for 1998. It is important for our colleagues to note that because of these high tariffs most products made in America do not have access to the Chinese market. Indeed, less than 2 percent of our exports are allowed into the Chinese market, while we import nearly over 35 percent of Chinese exports into our market.

The list goes on and on about lack of market access, violation of intellectual property which continues (ask the software industry), technology transfer, production transfer, transshipment of textile goods, and the use of forced labor for export. The trade violations alone would be enough to say that this is not, call it what we want, a normal trade relationship, and then when we consider the leverage that we would have with this huge trade deficit to improve the human rights situation in China and to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, my colleagues can see that we are wasting an opportunity.

Speaking of the President's trip, one of the commentators said, ''Well, when the President goes there, we will see that there's more in China than repression.'' Well, as long as repression is there, we should use every tool at our disposal to make sure that it does not exist. If we are true to who we are as Americans, the central core value of promoting democratic values should be central. It should be not only on the table, it should be the table on which other concerns rest.

And so I say with regret, ''Shame, shame, shame that the Committee on Ways and Means with the Committee on Rules is sneaking this in so that Members are forced to vote for something in the dark in the interests of passing a bigger law.''

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to respond to the statement of my very good friend from California (Ms. PELOSI).

For starters, this was not secretively stuck into this measure. It has been, discussed frankly for years. There are many people who for a long period of time have said, ''Why don't we have truth in advertising? Why is it that we call something that is not in fact a favored nation status what it is: normal trade relations?''

So for years people have been advocating this, and over the last several weeks a number of individuals have said, ''Gosh, as we proceed with the debate on the traditional MFN issue which will be coming up most likely the week of July 20, a number of people, Democrats and Republicans alike, said, ''Why don't we find an opportunity to finally establish normal

trade relations and call them exactly what they are?''.

There are five countries that do not enjoy what is now considered to be a so-called most-favored-nation trading status. They are Afghanistan, Cuba, Laos, North Korea and Vietnam. It is basically the rest of the world has this kind of status, and we believe very strongly that it is important for us to do what we can to get our Western values into China.

Now my friend from San Francisco very correctly talked about the imbalance of trade with the People's Republic of China that exists, and she is right, there is an imbalance of trade. But there are two points that I would like to make as it relates to that. First and foremost, she falls into that trap of the neo-mercantilist view of trade, that the only benefit for trade is exports; not recognizing that the standard of living in the United States of America is as high as it is because the world has access to our consumer market.

And the second point that I think is very important that needs to be made here is the fact that as we have observed job shifts, they have taken place within the Pacific Rim. It is not this flow of U.S. jobs that have been going to China, as some would have us believe, but it has been the shift of jobs from Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea and other countries within the Pacific Rim.

As we have seen those shifts take place, what has happened?

□ 1100

We have been able to see the cost of products coming into the United States and going to the other parts of the world come at a lower level. So it seems to me all we are providing here is truth in advertising by changing this from ''MFN'' to ''normal trade relations.'' It is the right thing to do. Even opponents of MFN in the past have told me, ''Why don't you call it exactly what it is?''

So we are doing the right thing here, and I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report when we proceed with it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would respond to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), in that I too am opposed to the changing of the name to normal trade relations from most-favored-nation, because I do not really think it is a normal trade situation.

I think it is a privilege to trade with this country. It is what this country is all about. It is what we stand for. We stand for fairness, we stand for fighting oppression. We stand for not only loving other people, but we also stand for displeasure when a country does something that is very much what we think is not only against the interests of our country, but against the interests of all people.

For years, even from the 18th century, we have spoken out about most-favored-nation. That is a name that is beyond symbolism. It carries the name of the United States. It means our country and what we stand for. It is a connotation that is good and it is right.

I remember when the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and myself went to Romania several years ago. The people in Romania, especially the people that had been oppressed, would press upon us as we spoke in churches and different places, and they would press notes all over us, put them in our pockets, and when we got back to our hotel at night, we would have 50, 60 notes of people telling us about torture and oppression, to please do something about it. Even then, under the old regime of Romania, people understood what most-favored-nation status was all about.

When we came back, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and myself sponsored legislation to take most-favored-nation away from Romania because it was not normal trade relations. It was something that is very special.

It took us three years to fight that, and we fought it on the floor. We finally succeeded, and a year later, a year later, the country's power, the country's government did fall. I cannot say it was as a result of us taking most-favored-nation away, but I think it helped because it enabled us in this country to speak out towards oppression, whether it be religious, political, economic, whatever it would be.

Most-favored-nation is something we have had for years in this country, and it is something that both people that are in favor and people that are not in favor, dissidents all over the world have come to understand what it means. It is not normal. It is a privilege, and we want to defend it. We believe in it, and that is why we are very much against this change in the name.

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

Madam Speaker, I would simply say that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and I obviously share the exact same goal. It is very clear that those of us who believe in the power of markets want to deal with the horrendous repression that exists in China and other parts of the world. It is just that we believe passionately that western values are best epitomized with the movement of free markets, and we believe that the best way to undermine political repression is to get those things in there. In fact, I have concluded and said here time and time again that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves living standards, which undermines political repression.

So I would just like the record to show, Madam Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and I share the exact same goals. We obviously are approaching them in a slightly different way.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. BILBRAY), my very good friend, who is an expert on tax issues and is very pleased with a provision that has been incorporated in this conference report dealing with the effective date on the Tax Code.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, I have to make an editorial note that this issue of what is a most-favored-nation status reminds me of the rest of the ''Washington speak''. This is the city where you can have a 7.5 percent increase and they call it a cut; call something a balanced budget that the rest of America would not call a balanced budget; and now we talk about most-favored-nation relationship, and it is a misnomer.

It is not about China or anything else. I think we need to talk about is Washington going to start speaking plain English like the rest of us? The most-favored-nation status to America happens to be Canada and Mexico. That is a fact of life. Some people may not like it, some of us are concerned about it, but I think the issue here about do we speak plain English when we start talking about our business in this body, I think there is a good argument of saying we should do it across the board, not just with the trade issue.

But getting back to home, let us talk about something near and dear to Americans here in the United States, and that is our tax structure, our Tax Code.

Madam Speaker, I happen to own a tax business and have owned a family tax business for a while now. My wife runs our tax business. I just got off the phone with the young lady who runs my business, my wife, and her comment was this. ''When you start talking taxes, you start talking thresholds, will you please try to make it as simple as possible?''

Why do Americans across this country have to go to people like my wife to be able to get their taxes done? It is because Washington keeps making it more complicated.

I want to praise this bill because it finally is getting back to the basics. Let us start with January 1 as being the beginning of the year. What a radical concept. Finally we are getting a message across that maybe Washington should start living by the rules that everybody else lives by, and one of them is January 1 should be the beginning of the time for our tax year, as much as possible.

I praise this bill and I want to reflect the praise that my wife sends to this Congress, of keep it simple when you can. Let us make it January 1, the beginning of the year. I want to thank the Congress for doing that.

Also, let us say this is the beginning of doing other things, of making the entire Tax Code simpler.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support this rule and this bill which will finally bring reform to the Internal Revenue System.

In my recent campaign I spoke about taxes with thousands of residents of the central coast of California. They told me three things: First, get the IRS off the backs of innocent taxpayers; second, simplify the Tax Code; and, third, please let us keep a little more of our hard-earned money in our pockets.

This important bill does all three. No longer will American taxpayers be considered guilty until proven innocent. The capital gains tax has been simplified, which will bring welcome relief to everyone who has struggled with this complicated new Schedule D form, and the capital gains provision will allow working families to use more of their investment income for important needs like retirement or college education.

This is a good bill. It is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise simply to associate myself with the very eloquent words of my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from Santa Barbara, California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

(Mr. ROTHMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to see that we are finally taking up passage of legislation designed to rein in the IRS. We have all heard the stories about the worst IRS nightmares in the Nation, people committing suicide, families going bankrupt and losing their small businesses. Last October I walked door-to-door and business-to-business in my district and heard from taxpayers about their own battles with the IRS.

The IRS has an extremely important job to do, but today we are making their job a little bit easier, and we are making the IRS a more fair, more efficient, and more taxpayer-friendly agency. But my friends, this bill is only the beginning. Next we must repeal the marriage penalty, which punishes two-income married couples. A married couple pays more in income taxes than if they were unmarried. This is simply unfair and sends the wrong message about the importance of families in our country. We must repeal the marriage penalty now.

Finally, we must also make our Tax Code much simpler. Anyone who has spent long hours huddled over their 1040 with broken pencils and piles of frustration knows that our tax system today is simply too complicated. We must simplify the Tax Code so that the average American does not need a Ph.D. in accounting to complete his or her taxes.

I urge support for this first step in IRS reform.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to simply encourage my colleagues to support this rule. It is a very fair and balanced rule. It will finally bring about much needed reform of the Internal Revenue Service, which the American people are desperately seeking. It will provide truth in advertising by finally taking that MFN moniker and changing it to what it is, normal trade relations. I hope we can pass this overwhelmingly.

Of course, it will bring the very, very important end to that horrendous 18-month holding period on capital gains, which cannot be forgotten. I know my friend in the Chair was a cosponsor of H.R. 14 to cut that top rate on capital gains, and we are hoping to go further with that, but this is a very good first step.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4104, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 485 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 485

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4104) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI or clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 104, line 14, through page 106, line 12. The amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Madam Speaker, this is an open rule that waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failing to comply with clause 2(l)6 of rule XI requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report, or clause 7 of rule XXI, requiring printed hearings and reports to be available for 3 days prior to the consideration of general appropriation bills.

House Resolution 485 provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 485 also provides that the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole House.