

Now to the arms question. We have seen some success on the nuclear arms front and the transfer of weapons in that China has signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty of 1968, a very positive sign. If we eliminate MFN their need for hard currency will lead them to export weapons.

We are concerned about human rights violation. The Australians and the French are today in discussions with the Chinese in our attempts to improve the human rights situation in China. And one of the most famous journalists, who was a Chinese dissident, Tai Ching, who has been studying here in the United States, returned to China and made the statement very clearly that there is an improvement in the human rights situation.

Two months ago we saw that they released the three Catholic clerics who had been held prisoner. And, yes, there are other very serious cases which need to be addressed. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, we are on the road toward addressing those concerns. I hope very much that we will be able to give the President, President Bush, the tools to do just that.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend, one of my closest friends from California, that he has just made the greatest argument on behalf of the Solomon resolution to disapprove MFN for China. The point he made was that over the last decade we refused to give MFN status to the Soviet Union, 300 million people enslaved by communism.

The result of that refusal was to bring down the Iron Curtain, to tear down the Berlin Wall.

If we had done the same thing to China during the 1980's, communism would be no more in China. What we have done by giving MFN unconditionally is to prop up that Communist regime. Year after year after year, we continue to approve and reapprove MFN for China. Let us stop it today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a few minutes ago referred to the leadership in Communist China as an oligarchy of geriatric thugs. I think that says it very, very well. The fact of the matter is that just a short time ago people across this country watched in horror as we saw young Chinese people who had a Statue of Liberty built there in Tiananmen Square, literally ground into dog meat by tanks. They were stacked up like cordwood, and they were burned, thousands of them. We do not really know how many.

There are 10 million people, at least, in Communist gulags who are working as slave laborers—slave laborers. My colleague from California who just spoke a moment ago, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], indicated that this sort of thing no nation should tolerate, and we should not.

□ 1400

If we believe in human rights, if we believed in the dignity of man, if we believed in fairness, and democracy, and freedom, and all the things we hold dear, we cannot turn a blind eye to what is going on in Communist China, and it bothers me that the administration, which I support, wants to grant MFN to China at a time when these kinds of atrocities do take place. They say we have to keep our lines of communication with one billion people, the world's largest country. Well, I agree that we need to keep open our lines of communication, but that does not mean we have to do them any favors when they are doing this to their fellow man.

In the Soviet Union, we did not allow them MFN, and they were a much bigger threat to the United States than China will ever be. We turned our back on them. We said, "We're not giving you one dime of anything until you allow human rights violations to end," and until they allowed the Jewish people to be able to immigrate to Israel, to get out of their country. There were a lot of things that we stood up for against the Soviet Union, and yet Communist China, that has 10 million people in Communist gulags, women and children who are being tortured and suffering, given one little bowl of gruel a day so that they can continue to do the job of making shirts, wine, and other things that they send the West for us to buy so we can keep those people in power; we allow that sort of thing to go on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say to my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who has led the charge on this issue earlier, and my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who is leading the charge today, "I agree with you and congratulate you on your efforts," and I urge the administration to revisit this issue to not allow MFN to go on until they change their mode of behavior, until they allow human rights, until they let those people out of those Communist gulags, those slave laborers. This is something the United States of America should not allow to happen. We should not be a party to it. We should not stand up with them in any way until they allow the kinds of human rights that we believe are important to the human race.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has no further requests for time, I would simply urge support for the resolution and for the two bills that will follow it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING PREPRINTING OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 4312 AND H.R. 5236

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I probably will not object, but could the gentleman offer an explanation?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this is a communication from the Committee on Rules relating to legislation that will be pending before the Committee on Rules later this week.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman relate to which bills his announcement applies?

Mr. FROST. Yes; this is a communication from the Committee on Rules relating to the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992 and the Voting Rights Extension Act of 1992 and the status of that legislation that will be pending before the Committee on Rules later this week.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman from Texas would excuse me, I would ask him, "Are you making a request?"

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a notification to the House of how the Committee on Rules intends to proceed in this matter.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has received a request from the Committee on the Judiciary for a rule to H.R. 4312, the Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992, and H.R. 5236, the Voting Rights Extension Act of 1992, that would require amendments to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Although the Rules Committee has not decided upon this request, I wanted to alert Members on this possible requirement for H.R. 4312 and H.R. 5236 so that Members are prepared with their amendments. The Rules Committee is planning to meet on this bill Wednesday afternoon, July 22. It is anticipated that both measures will come to the

floor on Thursday, July 23. Therefore, to fully ensure Members' abilities to offer amendments under the requested rule, they should have those amendments appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the consideration of both bills.

Copies of the committee's reports and bills are available in the House Document Room. I appreciate the cooperation of all the Members.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 502 and H.R. 5318.

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

There was no objection.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 514, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 502) disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 502 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 502

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 2, 1992, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 514, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 502 would rescind China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status, effective 60 days after enactment. While I am sympa-

thetic to the sponsor's motivation for introducing this resolution, I must urge my colleagues to oppose House Joint Resolution 502 and to vote instead later today for the Pease-Pelosi bill, H.R. 5318.

Mr. Speaker, Members who support House Joint Resolution 502 will argue today that the United States must send a clear and unmistakable message to the Chinese leadership—that civilized people find China's behavior in the area of human rights, and many of its foreign policy actions, to be unacceptable. I fully agree. But voting for House Joint Resolution 502 is not the proper way to send that message.

A vote to cut off China's MFN status is a vote to cut off all potential influence of the United States over Chinese behavior. I will be the first to admit that we have not been as successful as any of us would like in bringing about improvements in China's behavior. However, I believe that our best hope for influencing Chinese behavior in the future is to continue to remain engaged in trade with China. Over the past year, we have made some progress in the areas of human rights, trade, and nuclear nonproliferation.

For example in the area of human rights, last October China issued its first white paper on human rights. In January, Premier Li Peng expressed the willingness of the Chinese Government to cooperate with other countries on human rights. And in June, we signed a memorandum of understanding with China which, for the first time, grants access by United States Government personnel to Chinese prisons.

In the area of trade, we signed a memorandum of understanding with China last February providing for improved intellectual property protection in China.

In the area of weapons non-proliferation, China agreed to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty last March and is participating in the Middle East arms control negotiations and in discussions to prevent the spread of chemical weapons.

What would have been the situation in these areas if the United States had severed its most important trade ties with China? Would the progress of the past year have been possible? The answer is clearly "no." Can and should we do more? The answer is clearly "yes."

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues not to vote to return China to its isolationist past but rather to support the more moderate approach of the Pease-Pelosi bill. The Pease-Pelosi bill will provide additional negotiating leverage for the administration to use in its future dealings with China. That bill sends a strong message to China's leaders, but keeps the door open to important contacts and improved relations with the Chinese people.

A vote for the pending resolution will only play into the hands of China's hard-line leaders, who would love noth-

ing more than to see their Western-oriented provinces and their people brought back under central control.

I urge my colleagues to oppose House Joint Resolution 502.

□ 1410

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and the Ways and Means ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], for their courtesy in allowing my resolution to come to the floor this afternoon in tandem with the Pease-Pelosi bill.

In the 3 years since the Chinese Communist dictatorship used tanks and machine guns against peaceful pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square, the United States' trade deficit with China has tripled. Let me repeat that. It has tripled. In the 3 years since the Berlin Wall was opened and Communist dictatorships throughout the Soviet bloc fell from power, the Chinese Communist dictatorship has reinforced its claim on absolute power. And the United States trade deficit with China has tripled. Let me repeat that again. It has tripled.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress is being asked to provide economic and humanitarian assistance to the countries of Europe that have thrown off the shackles of Communism, Congress is also being asked to underwrite once again Communist dictatorship in China. And still the United States' trade deficit with China continues to go up and up and up. While governments in the rest of the world move toward giving their people freedom and representation, the Chinese Communist dictatorship digs in its heels and resists even the slightest suggestion of political democratization and the slightest recognition at all of human rights.

And what does the Chinese Government get from the United States? A slap on the wrist one moment, with a few minor sanctions that were aimed mostly at placating China's critics here in the Congress. And then the next moment the Chinese Government is given an export license to increase our trade deficit more and more and more.

In 1989, the year of the Tiananmen Square massacre, trade between the United States and China had become so unbalanced in China's favor that we posted a \$6 billion deficit. That was back in 1989, 3 years ago. In 1991, 2 years later, we had a \$12.7 billion trade deficit with China, a deficit that was exceeded only by the one we have with Japan. This year our trade deficit with China is approaching an astronomical \$20 billion.

I say to my colleagues that it is China's most-favored-nation status that makes all of this possible.

This resolution which is now before us would disapprove the President's recommendation that China's MFN

LAHAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LENT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 399: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 408: Mr. ROSE.

H.J. Res. 422: Mr. EVANS and Mr. KASICH.

H.J. Res. 440: Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 455: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 469: Mr. DIXON, Mr. PURSELL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SARPALUIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STARK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.J. Res. 474: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. HYDE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 478: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.J. Res. 483: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.J. Res. 488: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 489: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ECKART, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.J. Res. 492: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EARLY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. UPTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MINK, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SWETT, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LENT, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STARK, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. HORN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. TANNER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TALLON, Mr. COLORADO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr.

MFUME, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.J. Res. 495: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.J. Res. 498: Mr. OLIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.J. Res. 506: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ROEMER.

H.J. Res. 520: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. HARRIS.

H. Con. Res. 11: Mr. McNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 92: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARPER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MINK, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KITTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. WISE.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. EARLY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 224: Mr. MINETA.

H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 322: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAXON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. HORN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 344: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. YATES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H. Res. 129: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Res. 296: Mr. MINETA.

H. Res. 478: Mr. ATKINS.

H. Res. 490: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 515: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ESPY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4312

By Mr. CONDIT:

—Page 7, line 2, after "State," insert "The prohibitions of this subsection also do not apply with respect to any State or political subdivision that does not receive a Federal grant to cover all expenses resulting from compliance with this subsection. The Attorney General may make such grants."

H.R. 5236

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

—page 2, strike lines 4 through 7.

—Page 2, line 8, strike "(5)" and insert "(4)".

—Page 2, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF PRECLEARANCE REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended by striking section 5.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) in section 4(a)(1), by striking subparagraph (D);

(2) in section 12, by striking "4, 5," each place it appears and inserting "4,"; and

(3) in section 14, by striking "or section 5" each place it appears.

—Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF PRECLEARANCE REQUIREMENT.

Section 5(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended by striking "with respect to which" the first place it appears and all that follows through "November 1, 1972" and inserting "shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualifications or prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on the date of the enactment of the Voting Rights Extension Act of 1992".

H.R. 5593

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—On page 97, after line 3, add the following new section:

Sec. 320. Legislative Line Item Veto Rescission Authority.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1992."

(b) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject to the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1993 which is subject to the terms of this Act if the President—

(1) determines that—

(A) such rescission would help balance the Federal budget, reduce the Federal budget deficit, or reduce the public debt;

(B) such rescission will not impair any essential Government functions;

(C) such rescission will not harm the national interest; and

(D) such rescission will directly contribute to the purpose of this Act of limiting discretionary spending in fiscal year 1993; and

(2) notifies the Congress of such rescission by a special message not later than 20 calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 1993 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority for fiscal year 1993. The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriations bill under this paragraph.

(c) RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.—(1)(A) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this section as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless during the period described in subparagraph (B), a rescission disapproval bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(B) The period referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) a congressional review period of 20 calendar days of session under subsection (e), during which Congress must complete action on the rescission disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval;

(ii) after the period provided in clause (i), an additional 10 days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission disapproval bill; and

(iii) if the President vetoes the rescission disapproval bill during the period provided in clause (ii), an additional 5 calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(2) If a special message is transmitted by the President under this section during any

Congress and the last session of such Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1)(B), the rescission shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in paragraph (1)(B) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section the term 'rescission disapproval bill' means a bill or joint resolution which only disapproves a rescission of discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 1993, in whole, rescinded in a special message transmitted by the President under this section.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this section, the President shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

(A) the amount of budget authority rescinded;

(B) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(C) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority pursuant to this section;

(D) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission; and

(E) all factions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the re-

scission and the decision to effect the rescission, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(2) TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES TO HOUSE AND SENATE.—

(A) Each special message transmitted under this section shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each such message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(B) Any special message transmitted under this section shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(3) REFERRAL OF RESCISSION DISAPPROVAL BILL.—Any rescission disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) Any rescission disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this section.

(B) Debate in the Senate on any rescission disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and con-

trolled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(C) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(D) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed 1, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(5) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(A) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission budget authority transmitted by the President under this section.

(B) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission disapproval bill.

(C) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.