

actually do, that they do not overstate their case, and that in fact doctors can prescribe a drug knowing that it is safe.

The Speaker has led the criticism, along with some very conservative groups, of the Food and Drug Administration and suggested at one point that we should even privatize the Food and Drug Administration. I think this is a valid policy debate which should take place. I for one oppose the idea of privatization of the Food and Drug Administration. I think as an independent Government agency they are doing a good job. They can certainly improve on it. All of us can improve on our performance. But I would hate to see an agency as important as the Food and Drug Administration go by the way-side.

The relevance of the FDA issue to the GOPAC issue is brought in clear focus by this Los Angeles Times piece. Why would the executives or lobbyists for seven companies regulated by FDA be major donors to the Speaker's political action committee and then the Speaker take the position that the Food and Drug Administration should be disbanded?

□ 1430

This is a legitimate inquiry. It could be the Speaker has good reason, and he can make that case known to the American people in detail. But at least now there is a suggestion that there may be a link between this political action committee and the political position taken by the Speaker.

I started in politics working for a fellow by the name of Paul Douglas, who was a Senator from Illinois who served between 1948 and 1966. He was my mentor and inspiration when it came to the question of ethics. I may serve in this body the remainder of this term and maybe longer. I will certainly never reach his level of ethical standards. He set one that very few people will ever be able to reach. But he was very, very mindful of the need to make full disclosure.

He used to say, "Sunshine is the best antiseptic. Put it all on the table." My friend, Senator PAUL SIMON from Illinois and I took him to heart. We make public disclosure each year far beyond the requirements of the Federal law. It does not guarantee that a public servant will be honest, but at least it shows we are prepared to open our books.

I think that is the best thing now for the Speaker to consider when it comes to GOPAC. Open the books. Let us see what is in there. Let us get it behind us. Let us make full disclosure, so any future debate over the Food and Drug Administration or any other agency is not tainted by the question of whether contributions to the \$7 million political action committee had anything to do with the Republican agenda.

This is part of what I consider openness in Government. We have heard a lot said over the last 3 weeks about a new standard of openness coming from

the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives. Let me say at the outset, and probably to the surprise of the Speaker and others, that I salute the Republicans for many of the changes they have made in this Institution. On the opening day of the session I voted for most of them, and I feel they were steps in the right direction, ending proxy voting, making committee hearings open to the public, something I had done in my own subcommittee for the last 2 years. I think that instills new confidence in what we are about here.

This House of Representatives, this Institution, needs to have more approval from the voters across America. Certainly openness in disclosure is a good step in that process. I think the same is true for political action committees. I think the same is certainly true for the Speaker's GOP action committee, GOPAC. Full disclosure will help to restore confidence not only in the Speaker's activities, but in this institution. What the Los Angeles Times said in its article today, what the Denver Post raised in its article yesterday, certainly leave a lot of people questioning what the agenda is from the Republican side and how it has been influenced.

We have a long way to go. I think disclosure as the Speaker called for in his 1984 book is a step in the right direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1704

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EHLERS) at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

□ 1705

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, with Mr. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, January 27, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA] had been disposed of, and section 4 was open for amendment at any point.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to start our fifth day of dealing with H.R. 5, the unfunded mandates legislation. By my calculations we have spent, thus far, about 15 hours, almost 16 hours, on amendments, 16 amendments to H.R. 5, and we are still on section 4. So we are averaging almost 60 minutes per amendment. Many of these are duplicative or very similar in nature.

Mr. Chairman, I am totally supportive of the open rule process which we have been operating under, but I think at this hour, at this point in time, if we continue with the 130 or so amendments that are still pending, we are talking about maybe 150 hours of deliberation to complete debate on all these amendments.

I think that most Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to get to consider some of the other issues that are in debate, or in controversy, on this legislation other than the exemption issue. So at this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on each amendment, and all amendments thereto, to section 4 and to titles I, II, and III be limited to 2 hours per title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, first of all we are told we are going to have an open rule, and we are trying to get through the amendments that we have here. I think we have done so rather expeditiously, if my colleagues will agree.