Reno to please give to the Judiciary Committee as rapidly as possible the findings from the task force she has set up as to what we can do to make women's lives much more secure as they attend family planning clinics. People forget that women get all of their health care almost from family planning clinics during their reproductive years, and the domestic terrorism that has been going on is absolutely unacceptable.

The people saying that if women want this they have to go out and hire private armies to secure it is ridiculous. This Constitution guarantees equal protection of the law. It never says you get your constitutional rights only if you can hire an army to enforce it for you. That is what the Federal Government is there for.

So I certainly hope that we can get those recommendations back from our law enforcement community and we can move on it.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPUBLICAN REFORMS

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a couple of observations this morning. Much has been said on the other side of the aisle about the fact that the Democrat Party was unable to offer amendments to the rules changes that were offered yesterday. That was true, but the truth is in the 200-year history of this Congress, when the opening day activities begin, the majority party submits a rules package to the Congress for their approval and there has never been any opportunity to amend that opening day document.

We this year, because we had campaigned for years and years in the minority to open up this House to openness and fairness, and accountability, had proposed a number of major changes to the rules of the House. What we did is we took the old rules of the 103d Congress which had been proposed year in and year out by the Democratic Party, and we brought those rules to the floor with certain changes. And there were eight significant changes that we wanted to make. They were reforms that the American people have been asking for this Congress to enact for many, many years, because we had failed to enact those reforms, this Congress had dropped in esteem in the eyes of the American people to something like 20 percent. And that is embarrassing to a Member like me that holds this body in the greatest esteem.

So we offered these changes, and we also offered, every Member, not just Democrats but Republicans and Democrats alike, the opportunity to vote on each one of those changes that we were going to make from the rules that we had been operating under the Democrat leadership all of those years. They were changes like reducing the committees and subcommittee reorganization, and staffs. We eliminated three full committees. We eliminated more than 20 subcommittees and that resulted in reducing this congressional bureaucracy by more than 600 jobs.

Why is that significant? We never like to put people out of work. But the truth is over the last several decades this Congress had just grown and grown and grown. The number of committees and subcommittees and staff had proliferated to a point that this is where gridlock really existed. A lot of press and the media used to say that gridlock was caused between Democrats and Republicans, because we Republicans controlled the White House and the Democrats controlled both bodies of this Congress.

That was not entirely true, and it became evident when the Democrats won control of the White House and President Clinton was elected. And then that was supposed to end all gridlock, but lo and behold, gridlock continued. So it was not Republicans and Democrats.

So then the media blamed it on conservatives and liberals. What it boiled down to it was not Republicans and Democrats, it was not liberals and conservatives, it was the bureaucracy of this Congress.

One good example of this is when President Clinton offered up last year his health care reform package, and lo and behold, that package was sent to three different committees in this Congress, referred jointly to three different committees and dozens and dozens of subcommittees.

What did that mean. That meant that bill was dead on arrival because of all of the little fiefdoms that had to begin to look at that piece of legislation.

We in this rules package yesterday made one great significant change to that and the Speaker of this House now is going to take any piece of legislation that comes before this body, if it is offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] or the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], it is going to be assigned to one primary committee. That can be the Committee on Commerce, it could be the Committee on Rules, which I am the chairman of, but it will go to one primary committee. If there is another jurisdiction involved such as maybe a tax significance of some kind, then the Committee on Commerce will send that little portion over to Ways and Means with instructions to act on it and get it back. But it means that this bureaucracy, this gridlock is going to be broken because we have shrunk the size of this Congress. And incidentally, we are not through doing it yet; we are going to continue.

□ 1050

But we also have set the example for what we intend to do to this Federal Government. There was an election back on November 8, and I am going to tell you that election really surprised this Member of Congress. I have been here suffering in the minority for 16 years, and I never in this world thought that I, JERRY SOLOMON, would

ever become chairman of the Committee on Rules in this House. Because the Rules Committees are controlled by the majority party, and because the Democrats have had such a wide majority of Members, I just thought that was impossible.

But the truth of the matter is the American people spoke, and they spoke very loudly, and we elected Republicans across this Nation in places we never ever thought that they would serve, and now we Republicans have that majority. We are going to use the example of shrinking this Congress by the three committees and dozens of subcommittees and eliminating 600-plus jobs. We are going to send the example that that is what we want to do to the Federal Government as well. We want to carry on the second part of the Reagan revolution that ended in 1983.

You know, Ronald Reagan came in here in 1981, and we were able to push through the Reagan program, which really began to tighten the belts of the Federal Government. We dealt with entitlements, and in doing so, and all of those that voted for all of those tough medicine cuts, we had to go back and face the electorate 2 years later in the Reagan administration's term. Lo and behold, we lost an awful lot of Republicans, because all of the special interest groups went after them. ''You cut my entitlement program. I am not voting for you.''

We lost a lot of good conservative Democrats, because they voted with us, too, because it was a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats that ran through the first 2 years of the Reagan programs, and we began to turn this country around.

After the election in 1982, after 2 years of Ronald Reagan, we no longer had that kind of coalition. We no longer had 192 Republicans to go with about 40 good conservative Democrats, because we now were down to about 173 Republicans. We lost about 20 of those conservative Democrats.

So now Ronald Reagan could no longer have the votes on the floor of these two bodies to carry out his revolution. So he had to become a compromise President.

You might keep this in mind, because Bill Clinton is going to have to make this decision very shortly. Ronald Reagan had to decide whether he was going to become the veto king or become a compromiser. He chose the latter. He wanted to accomplish what he could with this vision and the vision of those who supported him.

As a result of that, he became less effective. He was tremendously effective in 1981 and 1982. In 1983 and 1984 he had to be a compromiser. He only got a little bit of what he wanted. Then there was another election. He lost more of the conservative philosophy, and he had to compromise at even higher levels. This carried right on through into 1988 when George Bush was elected and, of course, by that time we had dropped in numbers to the point where really the Reagan revolution had stopped.

What I was getting at in the beginning was this revolution now has started all over again. The American people have spoken, because they want this Congress and this White House to shrink the size of the Federal Government and shrink the size of the power of the Federal Government and grow the private sector, because that is what this country is all about.

We never were intended when we formed this Republic of States into a U.S. Government, we never intended for this to be a big Government that was going to rule the lives of the American people. This Republic of States was formed for the specific purpose of providing a common defense for the States of this Nation.

Lo and behold, now we have gotten into all of these other myriad of programs.

We are going to change all of that. We are going to restructure this Government. We are going to shrink the size of it. We are going to give the power back to the States and back to the American people.

Now, having said all of that, I just wanted to point out to the Members what is going to be happening in the next several weeks on the floor, because Speaker GINGRICH, as you know, has put out the word that we are going to be a working Congress for this 100 days, and that we are expected to be in Washington working 5 days a week during the months of January, February, and March.

Well, some people yesterday were questioning why we do not have legislation on the floor today, for instance, and Friday and next Monday and Tuesday. Well, again, I just want to point out that I was the ranking Republican serving in the minority on the Committee on Rules, and for years and years we saw the fact that minority rights were waived and that Members really did not have the opportunity to participate in the debate on this floor, offering amendments, and never had the chance to really read legislation.

I would point out what happened. You know, in the days of a man named Tip O'Neill, he was a tough partisan Democrat who sat in that chair right there. Although he was tough and he was partisan, he was one of the fairest Speakers that we have ever had. He was willing to bring legislation to this floor and let the House work its will. He did not discriminate against his own conservative Democrats even though he was a liberal, and he allowed them to offer amendments. Only 15 percent of the rules that brought legislation to this floor were brought here in a restricted manner. They were open rules.

There was much talk yesterday that we had closed rules that brought legislation to the floor. The truth is there were no rules at all. We do not have a Committee on Rules. The truth is we do not have any rules at all. Our Committee on Rules, which I am the chairman of, will not even organize until this afternoon at 2 o'clock, and from that point on, I have been instructed by our new Speaker GINGRICH that we will be as open and fair and as accountable to the American people and to this Congress and to all Members of the Congress regardless of political or philosophical persuasion. He has instructed me to try to have open rules and fair rules be the norm of this Congress.

We are going to go back to the days of Tip O'Neill when we had free and unfettered debate on this floor for the most part. That does not mean that every rule is going to be open, that every rule is not going to be restricted. Because there are times when we are dealing with national security, when we are going to debate the national defense budget which the chairman up there sits on the committee. We are going to have to have a structured rule. We will have to have limited debates. But we will make sure the liberals and the conservatives both have their amendments in order so that we can have a reasonable debate.

There are times when we will be debating intelligence matters that might affect the national security of this country, and we might have to have structured, restricted rules in those cases. There are other cases when we will be dealing with the U.S. Tax Code. That is something that is extremely complex, and you cannot bring bills on the floor and just have unfettered debate and amendments offered on any part of that Code. It would be a disaster.

When we develop budgets over a 2-year period, you have to be able to depend on the revenues that are coming in in that 2-year period. There are times when we will not have open and free, unfettered debate. We will have negotiations with the minority, and I can assure you I am going to follow Speaker GINGRICH's suggestions that the open rule be the norm. When I go to the organizational meeting this afternoon, I will be instructing the other members of the committee to do just that.

In regard to minority rights, there is a chart next to me, and this is why I took the well today, to talk about how legislation will come to this floor. The truth of the matter is that under the rules of the House that we adopted yesterday which provide for openness and fairness, and I key in on fairness and accountability, in being fair, we want to be fair to the minority as well. I know what it was like to be persecuted in the minority.

The truth of the matter is when a piece of legislation, any one of these pieces of legislation that were in our 100-days contract, when they were introduced yesterday, they were assigned to committees.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act will be brought to the floor. It is a balanced-budget amendment to the Constitution

and a line-item veto giving the President a tool to eliminate wasteful spending.

We are setting hearings. And, Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the January tentative committee activity for hearings on the 100-days contract.

JANUARY: TENTATIVE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Thursday, 1/5/95

W&M—Hearing: Contract Overview.

Friday, 1/6/95

SCI—Hearing: Sci & Tech in Govt., Sec. Brown.

Monday, 1/9/95

JUD—Hearing: Balanced Budget (or 1/10).
W&M—Hearing: Social Security.

Tuesday, 1/10/95

BUD—Joint Hearing: Dyn v. Stat Scoring.
GOV—Markup: Unfunded Mandate.
RUL—Markup: Unfun. Mandate (or 1/11).
W&M—Hearing: Contract Overview.

Wednesday, 1/11/95

ECOP—Hearing: Role of Gov't in Education & Wkplace Policy (or 1/12).
W&M—Hearing: Contract Overview.

Thursday, 1/12/95

INR—Hearing: Int'l Sit. & Clinton For. Pol., Fmr. Sec. State Baker.
RUL—Rule: Unfun. Mandate (or 1/13).
W&M—Hearing: Contract Overview.

Friday, 1/13/95

W&M—Hearing: Welfare Reform.

Monday, 1/16/95

JUD—Hearing (wk of): Term Limits, Legal Reform.
SCI—Hearing (wk of): Risk Assessment.
SCI—Markup (wk of): Hydrogen Research Bill.
SMB—Hearing (wk of): Sm. Bus. Tax Issues.

Tuesday, 1/17/95

NATS—Briefing: Classified Threat (or 1/18).
RUL—Rule: Balanced Budget (or 1/18).
W&M—Hearing: Contract Family Provisions.

Wednesday, 1/18/95

GOV—Hearing: Line-Item Veto.
ECOP—Hearing: Welfare Reform.
W&M—Hearing: Contract Family Provisions.

Thursday, 1/19/95

INR—Hearing: Kirkpatrick & Brzezinski.
W&M—Hearing: Contract Family Provisions.
Balanced Budget Floor Vote.

Friday, 1/20/95

W&M—Hm. Res. Hrng: Welfare Reform.
W&M—Oversight Hrng.

Monday, 1/23/95

AGR—Hearing (wk of): Food Stamp Reform.
SMB—Hearing (wk of): Regulatory Reform.
W&M—Hm. Res. Hrng: Welfare Reform.
W&M—Oversight Hrng.

Tuesday, 1/24/95

W&M—Hearing: Contract Savings & Invest. Provisions.

Wednesday, 1/25/95

GOV—Markup: Line-Item Veto.
W&M—Hearing: Contract Savings & Invest. Provisions.

Thursday, 1/26/95

W&M—Hearing: Contract Savings & Invest. Provisions.

Friday, 1/27/95

W&M—Oversight Hrng.

Monday, 1/30/95

RUL—Rule (wk of): Line-Item Veto.
W&M—Hm. Res. Hrng: Welfare Reform.
W&M—Trade Hrng: Customs Oversight.

Tuesday, 1/31/95

W&M—Hearing: Contract Savings & Invest. Provisions.

COMMITTEES

AGR: Agriculture
APP: Appropriations
BNK: Banking
COM: Commerce
ECOP: Econ. Opportunity
GOV: Gov Ref & Oversight
HOV: House Oversight
INR: Int'l Relations
JUD: Judiciary
NATS: National Security
PLR: Pub Lands & Rsrces
RUL: Rules
SMB: Small Business
STN: Stand. Off. Conduct
SCI: Science
TRN: Trans & Infrastruct.
VET: Vetrans' Affairs
W&M: Ways & Means.

And I would point to the chart here which shows what happens to a piece of legislation if there is a balanced-budget amendment, and that has now been sent to, as primary jurisdiction, the Committee on the Judiciary. When that Committee on the Judiciary finishes its hearings and when it marks up the balanced-budget amendment and when it is finished, it will send that bill to the Committee on Rules.

Now, in the meantime, let us say it happens today, on Thursday, the committee offers the bill reported and views are requested.

□ 1100

That means that for Friday, Monday, and Tuesday, the next 3 legislative days, that that bill is available for the minority to file their views, and they have the opportunity then to read that legislation. They have the opportunity to discuss with other Members who do not serve on the Committee on the Judiciary what they might want in those views. We have to wait 3 days. That takes us from today through next Tuesday just for the filing of those minority views. Then the committee files the report with this body right here, with the Clerk, and that is on Wednesday. Then Thursday, and this is already next Thursday, a week from now, there are 3 days for every single Member of this body to see that piece of legislation and to be able to review it.

Then the bill comes to the Committee on Rules upstairs, where we will meet, and we will then put out a rule which would allow whatever amendments are going to be allowed, whatever substitutes or alternatives. Then the bill will finally be able to come to this floor on the 10th day, on Wednesday.

So that is why you do not see legislation on the floor here today on these issues because we do intend in the new majority to honor the rights of the minority, and I am going to see to it with every bit of persuasion that I possess that we honor these rights for Members to be able to know what they are voting on, to be able to have that right, to vote and to offer amendments on the floor of this House.

Having said that, if I might, I would ask that my report on the issue of restrictive rules, which we compiled during the 103d Congress be put in the RECORD. This does show that during the 103d Congress, 73 rules that came to this floor, of that number, 70 percent of them were restricted or closed rules. Now, that is 70 percent. We are going to try to turn that around.

I am going to say to you now, today, we are shooting to have 70 percent of those rules open so that as the minority and even the majority Members over here will have the right to work their will on the floor of this Congress.

I ask that that be put into the RECORD.

The document referred to is as follows:

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	104	31	30	73	70

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: ''Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities,'' 95th–102d Cong.; ''Notices of Action Taken,'' Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Oct. 7, 1994.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (d–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1(not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. (Mar. 24, 1993).

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103D CONG.—Continued

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173 May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176.. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of ''Fast Track''	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401–0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. F: 205–216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D–109; R–40)		A: 246–172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237–169. A: 234–169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D–3; R–9)	1 (D–1; R–0)	A: 213–191–1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization		91 (D–67; R–24)	A: 241–182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238–188 (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D–0; R–7)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 240–185. A: 225–195. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 239–150. (Oct. 15, 1993).
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 273, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	PQ: 235–187. F: 149–254. (Oct. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D–7; R–7; I–1)	10 (D–7; R–3)	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 282, Oct. 20, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 281: Continuing appropriations through Oct. 28, 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 286, Oct. 27, 1993	O	H.R. 334: Lumbee Recognition Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 287, Oct. 27, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 283: Continuing appropriations resolution	1 (D–0; R–0)	0	A: 252–170. (Oct. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 289, Oct. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 2151: Maritime Security Act of 1993	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 293, Nov. 4, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 170: Troop withdrawal Somalia	N/A	N/A	A: 390–8. (Nov. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 299, Nov. 8, 1993	MO	H.R. 1036: Employee Retirement Act–1993	2 (D–1; R–1)	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 9, 1993).
H. Res. 302, Nov. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 1025: Brady handgun bill	17 (D–6; R–11)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 238–182. (Nov. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 303, Nov. 9, 1993	O	H.R. 322: Mineral exploration	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Nov. 16, 1993).
H. Res. 304, Nov. 9, 1993	C	H.J. Res. 288: Further CR, FY 1994	N/A	N/A	
H. Res. 312, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3425: EPA Cabinet Status	27 (D–8; R–19)	9 (D–1; R–8)	F: 191–227. (Feb. 2, 1994).
H. Res. 313, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 796: Freedom Access to Clinics	15 (D–9; R–6)	4 (D–1; R–3)	A: 233–192. (Nov. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 314, Nov. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 3351: Alt Methods Young Offenders	21 (D–7; R–14)	6 (D–3; R–3)	A: 238–179. (Nov. 19, 1993).
H. Res. 316, Nov. 19, 1993	C	H.R. 51: D.C. statehood bill	1 (D–1; R–0)	N/A	A: 252–172. (Nov. 20, 1993).
H. Res. 319, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3: Campaign Finance Reform	35 (D–6; R–29)	1 (D–0; R–1)	A: 220–207. (Nov. 21, 1993).
H. Res. 320, Nov. 20, 1993	MC	H.R. 3400: Reinventing Government	34 (D–15; R–19)	3 (D–3; R–0)	A: 247–183. (Nov. 22, 1993).
H. Res. 336, Feb. 2, 1994	MC	H.R. 3759: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations	14 (D–8; R–5; I–1)	5 (D–3; R–2)	PQ: 244–168. A: 342–65. (Feb. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 352, Feb. 8, 1994	MC	H.R. 811: Independent Counsel Act	27 (D–8; R–19)	10 (D–4; R–6)	PQ: 249–174. A: 242–174. (Feb. 9, 1994).
H. Res. 357, Feb. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 3345: Federal Workforce Restructuring	3 (D–2; R–1)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: VV (Feb. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 366, Feb. 23, 1994	MO	H.R. 6: Improving America's Schools	NA	NA	A: VV (Feb. 24, 1994).
H. Res. 384, Mar. 9, 1994	MC	H. Con. Res. 218: Budget Resolution FY 1995–99	14 (D–5; R–9)	5 (D–3; R–2)	A: 245–171 (Mar. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 401, Apr. 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 4092: Violent Crime Control	180 (D–98; R–82)	68 (D–47; R–21)	A: 244–176 (Apr. 13, 1994).
H. Res. 410, Apr. 21, 1994	MO	H.R. 3221: Iraqi Claims Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Apr. 28, 1994).
H. Res. 414, Apr. 28, 1994	O	H.R. 3254: NSF Auth. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 3, 1994).
H. Res. 416, May 4, 1994	C	H.R. 4296: Assault Weapons Ban Act	7 (D–5; R–2)	0 (D–0; R–0)	A: 220–209 (May 5, 1994).
H. Res. 420, May 5, 1994	O	H.R. 2442: EDA Reauthorization	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 10, 1994).
H. Res. 422, May 11, 1994	MO	H.R. 518: California Desert Protection	N/A	N/A	PQ: 245–172 A: 248–165 (May 17, 1994).
H. Res. 423, May 11, 1994	O	H.R. 2473: Montana Wilderness Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (May 12, 1994).
H. Res. 428, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 2108: Black Lung Benefits Act	4 (D–1; R–3)	N/A	A: VV (May 19, 1994).
H. Res. 429, May 17, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995	173 (D–115; R–58)		A: 369–49 (May 18, 1994).
H. Res. 431, May 20, 1994	MO	H.R. 4301: Defense Auth., FY 1995		100 (D–80; R–20)	A: Voice Vote (May 23, 1994).
H. Res. 440, May 24, 1994	MC	H.R. 4385: Natl Hiway System Designation	16 (D–10; R–6)	5 (D–5; R–0)	A: Voice Vote (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 443, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4426: For. Ops. Approps, FY 1995	39 (D–11; R–28)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 233–191 A: 244–181 (May 25, 1994).
H. Res. 444, May 25, 1994	MC	H.R. 4454: Leg Branch Approp, FY 1995	43 (D–10; R–33)	12 (D–8; R–4)	A: 249–177 (May 26, 1994).
H. Res. 447, June 8, 1994	O	H.R. 4539: Treasury/Postal Approps 1995	N/A	N/A	A: 236–177 (June 9, 1994).
H. Res. 467, June 28, 1994	MC	H.R. 4600: Expedited Rescissions Act	N/A	N/A	PQ: 240–185 A:Voice Vote (July 14, 1994).
H. Res. 468, June 28, 1994	MO	H.R. 4299: Intelligence Auth., FY 1995	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 19, 1994).
H. Res. 474, July 12, 1994	MO	H.R. 3937: Export Admin. Act of 1994	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 14, 1994).
H. Res. 475, July 12, 1994	O	H.R. 1188: Anti. Redlining in Ins	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 20, 1994).
H. Res. 482, July 20, 1994	O	H.R. 3838: Housing & Comm. Dev. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 21, 1994).
H. Res. 483, July 20, 1994	O	H.R. 3870: Environ. Tech. Act of 1994	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 26, 1994).
H. Res. 484, July 20, 1994	MC	H.R. 4604: Budget Control Act of 1994	3 (D–2; R–1)	3 (D–2; R–1)	PQ: 245–180 A: Voice Vote (July 21, 1994).
H. Res. 491, July 27, 1994	O	H.R. 2448: Radon Disclosure Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 28, 1994).
H. Res. 492, July 27, 1994	O	S. 208: NPS Concession Policy	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (July 28, 1994).
H. Res. 494, July 28, 1994	MC	H.R. 4801: SBA Reauth & Amdmts. Act	10 (D–5; R–5)	6 (D–4; R–2)	PQ: 215–169 A: 221–161 (July 29, 1994).
H. Res. 500, Aug. 1, 1994	MO	H.R. 4003: Maritime Admin. Reauth.	N/A	N/A	A: 336–77 (Aug. 2, 1994).
H. Res. 501, Aug. 1, 1994	O	S. 1357: Little Traverse Bay Bands	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 502, Aug. 1, 1994	O	H.R. 1066: Pokagon Band of Potawatomi	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 3, 1994).
H. Res. 507, Aug. 4, 1994	O	H.R. 4217: Federal Crop Insurance	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 5, 1994).
H. Res. 509, Aug. 5, 1994	MC	H.J. Res. 373/H.R. 4590: MFN China Policy	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 9, 1994).
H. Res. 513, Aug. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 4906: Emergency Spending Control Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 17, 1994).
H. Res. 512, Aug. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 4907: Full Budget Disclosure Act	N/A	N/A	A: 255–178 (Aug. 11, 1994).
H. Res. 514, Aug. 9, 1994	MC	H.R. 4822: Cong. Accountability	33 (D–16; R–17)	16 (D–10; R–6)	PQ: 247–185 A: Voice Vote (Aug. 10, 1994).
H. Res. 515, Aug. 10, 1994	O	H.R. 4908: Hydrogen Etc. Research Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 19, 1994).
H. Res. 516, Aug. 10, 1994	MC	H.R. 3433: Presidio Management	12 (D–2; R–10)	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Aug. 19, 1994).
H. Res. 532, Sept. 20, 1994	O	H.R. 4448: Lowell Natl. Park	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 26, 1994).
H. Res. 535, Sept. 20, 1994	O	H.R. 4422: Coast Guard Authorization	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 22, 1994).
H. Res. 536, Sept. 20, 1994	MC	H.R. 2866: Headwaters Forest Act	16 (D–5; R–11)	9 (D–3; R–6)	PQ: 245–175 A: 246–174 (Sept. 21, 1994).
H. Res. 542, Sept. 23, 1994	O	H.R. 4008: NOAA Auth. Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 26, 1994).
H. Res. 543, Sept. 23, 1994	O	H.R. 4926: Natl. Treatment in Banking	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 29, 1994).
H. Res. 544, Sept. 23, 1994	O	H.R. 3171: Ag. Dept. Reorganization	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 28, 1994).
H. Res. 551, Sept. 27, 1994	MO	H.R. 4779: Interstate Waste Control	22 (D–15; R–7)	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 28, 1994).
H. Res. 552, Sept. 27, 1994	O	H.R. 4683: Flow Control Act	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Sept. 29, 1994).
H. Res. 562, Oct. 3, 1994	MO	H.R. 5044: Amer. Heritage Areas	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Oct. 5, 1994).
H. Res. 563, Oct. 4, 1994	MC	H. Con. Res. 301: SoC Re: Entitlements	N/A	N/A	F: 83–339 (Oct. 5, 1994).
H. Res. 565, Oct. 4, 1994	MC	S. 455: Payments in Lieu of Taxes	N/A	N/A	A: 384–28 (Oct. 6, 1994).
H. Res. 570, Oct. 5, 1994	MC	H. J. Res. 416: U.S. in Haiti	N/A	N/A	A: 241–182 (Oct. 6, 1994).
H. Res. 576, Oct. 6, 1994	C	H.R. 5231: Presidio Management	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote (Oct. 7, 1994).

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this opportunity to me.

I just want to make a comment with regard to the closed rules. I have sat in this Chamber day after day, as the gentleman from New York has, and I have great respect for my colleague. I have listened to his personal opposition to closed rules and the opposition of other

Republicans on the issue of closed rules. I just would like to take a second to lift some quotes here. Here is one by Representative DREIER, ''Each time a closed rule is foisted on the House, Members of Congress are denied the opportunity to represent their constituents.''

A quote from the Honorable Mr. SOLOMON: ''The people are sick and tired of political gamesmanship. They want back into their own House. They want it open and democratic and not closed and dictatorial.''

Representative PRYCE: ''With every closed rule, millions of voters are disenfranchised when their duly elected Representatives are prevented from offering relevant amendments to bills that we consider.''

These are all quotes from the last session of the Congress. The gentleman has also commented that in fact part of what occurred here is the American public wanted to see change, wanted to see the process open, and wanted to see reform. I agree with the gentleman. I think we made so many strides in the last Congress to deal with reform in passing the Accountability Act. We passed it again last night. But I would just say this to you, that yesterday, something that really happened on the floor probably is a first in the House; there were two closed rules, two gag rules offered on the first day.

The second of the closed rules was hidden within the closed rule, so it was a closed rule inside a closed rule.

Now, the point is that if you want to have change, you cannot be talking in two directions and saying that the Democrats did it a year ago, therefore, ''We have a right to do it now.'' The issue is if you truly believe that the process should be open. We had a historic opportunity yesterday on the floor of this House to demonstrate two things: openness of this process. There should have been an opportunity for Democrats to amend the Accountability Act and to deal with a vote on a gift ban and that we should have taken this very historic day and turned it into that opportunity to say to the American people that in fact we have changed, we have reformed this body, this institution; we opened up the process and people can amend and debate on this floor and we have separated ourselves from the special interests who have an overwhelming effect in this body and who have a direct effect on legislation.

On both of these instances, the opportunity was missed. I say that more in sorrow than I do in outrage or anger because I think that the public is demanding reform, an opportunity to do so, but you cannot say it and then not do it. And it is not good enough to say, ''You did it; therefore, it is now our opportunity to do it.'' We cannot have that on the floor of this House.

Mr. SOLOMON. What the gentlewoman says makes a lot of sense. I am going to throw out a challenge to the gentlewoman because we probably will adjourn this first of the session of the 104th Congress, hopefully, sometime in October, although in an off year, and a coming presidential year, we could be here until December. I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], that I hope that does not happen.

But I want to throw out a challenge to the gentlewoman. I want her to judge us by our overall performance, and particularly I want the gentlewoman to hold me accountable. I want the gentlewoman to sit down here with me on the floor of this Congress in October or November, and let us see how open these rules were. Let us judge it at that time. I am going to pledge to the gentlewoman to try to turn this around; instead of having 70 percent closed rules and restricted rules, we are going to have 70 percent open and unrestricted rules, if we possibly can.

So let us judge our performance then, in October or thereabouts.

Ms. DELAURO. I would be happy to cooperate with my colleague. I also believe it is one thing for me to hold anyone accountable, but we are all accountable to the American public. That is what is at issue. That is what happens on the floor of this House. It is the people who send us here who hold us accountable for our openness, our sincerity, or compassion, our actions, for the opportunity to do the things that they send us here to do on their behalf and to raise their standard of living, to separate out the special interests in this body. Ultimately, they will be the deciders. But I am happy to accept the gentleman's challenge.

Mr. SOLOMON. I look forward to it.

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to a very important member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], from Carmel, CA, who was the cochairman of the congressional task force appointed by the Speaker to reform this House and who had more input into the legislation we adopted yesterday than any other Member I know.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this opportunity to me. I would like to simply rise in strong support of the case that the gentleman has been making.

Quite frankly, having just entered the Chamber, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, who has just talked about the need for accountability, compassion, concern, responding to the wishes of the American people. That is exactly what happened right here just a few hours ago before we adjourned the first day of the 104th Congress, by creating the kind of openness that my friend said is absolutely essential if we are going to effectively do our job.

It seems to me, as we look at the challenges ahead over the next 99 days, we are going to easily tackle every one of these problems. But we have to do it. We have to do it not only because we stood on the steps of the Capitol on September 27 and signed that contract, letting the American people know we would bring to the floor in the first 100 days those 10 pieces of legislation, but because so many of them are the right thing to do.

We are not simply putting into place legislation which was structured, as many in the media have said, based on public opinion polls. These are the kinds of things that we on this side of the aisle have been trying for years and, in many cases, decades, to bring to the floor of the Congress.

Now, I think the point that the chairman of the Committee on Rules is making is that we are in a position where we have been denied the opportunity to even have a hearing on so many of these measures. That is what we are planning to do. We want to create a fair and an open process here, which unfortunately, the pattern of leadership that we have seen at least over the last decade and a half, the last 15 years, has been such that we have unfortunately not been able to have the kind of openness we would like.

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Rules for his special order, and I want to thank him.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me first of all just say to the gentleman that we really appreciate all the work that he did, the work he did particularly on realignment of the committee jurisdictions and reducing the size of the committees and subcommittees. That has really helped to make this a functioning body in the next 2 years. I know that the gentleman has not finished yet.

Mr. DREIER. That is just what I was going to say.

Mr. SOLOMON. I know the gentleman has not finished it yet.

Mr. DREIER. That is exactly what I was going to say. There are many people who would like to believe that January 4th ended the process of political and congressional reform. Nothing could be further from the truth because we plan to continue.

My friend knows we passed a resolution in the Republican conference which calls for further review of the reforms that have been implemented. What we plan to do is to continue this process because we cannot reverse 40 years of one-party control and what existed here overnight.

So I thank my friend and appreciate his remarks.

□ 1110

Mr. SOLOMON. I am going to pile some burden on the gentleman's shoulders because at 2 o'clock this afternoon I will appoint him as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules, revamping the rules of this House and the committee structures. The gentleman is going to have his work cut out for him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I say to my chairman, ''I'd like to think I'm ready, willing, and able.''

Mr. SOLOMON. I say to the gentleman, ''You are.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], my good friend.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his attitude as far as openness of the House, as far as the future, and closed rules and open rules.

I have a little question I would like to ask of the gentleman:

In the past, whenever there has been an opportunity for legislation that is very controversial, and there is a question of trying to limit the amount and numbers of amendments—because in the past, as the gentleman realizes and I know from history—we have both been here—that when we had such legislation in the past, we sometimes see 200 or 250 amendments in 2 weeks, and some of them are just, as the gentleman knows as well as I——

Mr. SOLOMON. The California Desert Act?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, and others.

And so I recognize, and I think the gentleman recognizes, that there are opportunities and times when there would be restrictions on amendments. Now at other times there may not be that restriction, but sometimes there are both the sponsors of the legislation, the committee chairman and others, that have worked on that legislation, and other Members would like to have some idea of what amendments are going to be brought up. With a strictly open rule and nothing said, there is no opportunity. I can bring an amendment up here on the floor, blindside somebody on it as long as it is germane and it is in order. At times there have been provisions that the chairmen of the Committee on Rules have said, ''You're going to have to have them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within a certain length of time, or by a certain date, or by a certain hour of a certain date.''

Does the gentleman plan to use that type of restriction on amendments?

Mr. SOLOMON. Excuse me. I walked over on this side. I just wanted to show the gentleman we are cooperating.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. SOLOMON. We want to look out for the rights——

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I would much rather have 70 percent open rules than 70 percent closed rules. I have always said that. I agree with the gentleman that Members, all Members, have been sent here to be able to participate in the debate on the legislation, offer amendments, and have their ideas expressed also.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely right. The gentleman makes some sense, too, and, as I told the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] who is the former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and now the ranking minority member, that when the defense budget comes before the Committee on Rules, we want to be able to sit down with him because we cannot bring that bill to the floor under an open debate. We would be here for 3 months debating just that one bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. SOLOMON. And what we will do, we will negotiate with the minority, we will make sure if someone has an issue such as SDI; for instance, the Strategic Defense Initiative. We cannot allow 50 amendments on the Strategic Defense Initiative, but what we will do is we will allow a liberal's point of view, we will allow a conservative, and maybe a moderate. In other words, we will have three amendments dealing with that issue.

One thing we will eliminate is this business of king of the hill, and that is something, as the gentleman knows—the gentleman, I think, shares my view—that there is no place in this body for a king-of-the-hill procedure. What a king-of-the-hill procedure is is that one amendment might pass with 280 votes, and then another amendment will follow right behind it, wipe that out, and only get 218 votes, and the one with the fewer votes wins. Well, no more of that. I have spoken to Speaker GINGRICH about that. We are going to try to do away with this king-of-the-hill procedure, and we are going to let the best man win, or the best amendment win, or the best alternative win. The one with the most votes will win. That is how it should be.

There might come a time when we want to allow the printing of the amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to debate. We might even go so far as to have those amendments numbered so they will be easier to identify. I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is a very diligent Member of this House, and he reads the amendments, and sometimes it is hard to follow which amendment is being called up at certain times. One Member may have 10 amendments resting at the desk, and he calls up an amendment, and we do not know what it is, what the text is. So, if we number those amendments, it will make a lot more sense.

So, there will be times on complex issues when we will do that. Otherwise we will try to bring bills to the floor under an open rule process and let the Members offer amendments as they see fit right from the floor.

Mr. VOLKMER. The last comment I would like to make to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is that I could understand in the resolution that we had yesterday, as far as the actual rules changes, and I could understand the provision there for closed rules. We have always had that. We have never had anything, as long as I have been here, any different. So, I am not objecting to that.

But I do have a strong disappointment, a very strong disappointment, in the majority in requiring a closed rule.

I know the gentleman did not have a Committee on Rules, but I could read, too, the gentleman from New York, in here the provision in regard to what we call the compliance legislation, and what I am saddened by is that that bill, which is a good bill, has overwhelming support, we all supported it last year, and it went to the Senate and died, so it still has not become law. I listened to the speeches here this morning, some of the 1-minutes saying that we have now placed the House under all the laws of the United States that affect all private business and industry.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, ''We haven't done that yet, JERRY. You know that, and I know that, and until it passes the Senate, comes out of conference, goes to the President and is signed, we haven't done anything.''

We passed it. We did that last year. It does not do anything until it becomes law.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is right.

Mr. VOLKMER. All right. So let us tell the American people we still got a ways to go.

But my problem is what was done yesterday on that bill is that we in the minority, we in the minority, will never, never have an opportunity to change one word in that law, not one word.

Now that is not part of the rule; that is legislation. We should have been given an opportunity to offer amendments to that legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, I understand.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am very disappointed.

Mr. SOLOMON. I understand the gentleman's logic, and I share that view to a certain extent, and, as a matter of fact, I even spoke on the fact that I did not want to see the accountability bill, if it were going to be changed in any way, come to this floor under a closed rule. There was talk, as the gentleman knows. There were negotiations going on, both Democrats and Republicans negotiating with the Senate, to put together the differences and to bring the accountability bill, revised with the Senate concerns, with Democrat concerns, into the bill and bring it onto the floor yesterday under a closed rule with no amendments. I objected to that. As a matter of fact, I refused to let that happen because there then would not have been a bill that was debated on this floor, was amended on this floor, and passed overwhelmingly with, I think, only four votes in opposition. I said, ''If you want to bring this bill on the floor tomorrow, you will bring the exact bill we had that we spent hours debating and that we spent hours amending and that we sent over to the Senate.''

The reason we brought it up yesterday, and finally they agreed to bring the same bill that passed this House, not some revised edition with these negotiations that could not be amended; the reason they brought that to this floor was so that we would not die, and we were afraid. As the gentleman knows, we put this off today, that bill could have languished for another

month by the time we get it on this calendar with all this 100 days business. The chances are it would have been next July or August, and one never can tell around here what happens. Bills disappear. They hide. They are never seen again.

We wanted to pass that bill. Seventy-three new Republicans, all of them, wanted that bill acted on yesterday. They wanted to have it done. We sent that bill over again to the Democrats that were working on it. Mr. Swett, who was a good Member of this body who is no longer here now, was not here, but other Members were. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] was one, I believe, and, in other words, to get their impact on the bill. But the truth of the matter is I do not think that the 13 new Democrats who were not here last year, they did not have a chance to vote on it.

□ 1120

I do not think they objected. They all voted for the bill yesterday afternoon. At any rate, what we have done is, we have now passed that bill. It will now go to the Senate. The Senate will revise it, as is their prerogative, and the bill then, if it is different, will either come back to us for the amendment process or it will go to conference, one or the other. They could send a Senate bill over here, in which case we would have a chance to revisit it, and you, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, will have an opportunity at that time to work your will on the bill, too.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to echo my comments.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman wish me to yield to her?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, first, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is missing a little bit of the point.

I will admit that when it goes into the conference, the Democrats who are on the conference committee, those few, may have an opportunity to make some changes in the bill, but, remember, it is only the bill that passed this House and the bill that passed the Senate that is going to be in the conference. It was clear to me yesterday, listening to the debate, that there were other Members who would have had amendments to that bill. If they had been permitted to offer them, they would have liked to offer those amendments. They did not get that opportunity, and they will never get that opportunity in the next 2 years. We will not revisit this bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I may just reclaim my time for 1 minute, I would have to disagree with the gentleman that they will never get the opportunity. We are going to try to be as fair as we can, and if there are other issues, we are going to revisit many of these issues that we discussed yesterday on the floor.

We heard the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] say that his committee and the Committee on Rules are going to mark up additional bills, and certainly your representatives on the Committee on Rules and other committees are gong to have an opportunity for input, and we will revisit the issue, and we will have another day to debate whatever amendments you wanted to offer.

So I think, on the gentleman's concerns, that he is going to be presently surprised at the openness when we are going to be able to revisit many of these issues.

Mr. VOLKMER. You will have another compliance bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. We could very well, yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Another accountability bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the sentiments of my colleague. That is many respects is what I think was hoped for in terms of change, particularly by the American public, and as far as the rules are concerned, I truly believe in the gentleman's objection, because again, he talks on this floor about open rules all the time. And yet for the first day, for this opportunity to come up and to pass this bill, I would just say that it was business as usual, so that we do not have the opportunity.

I worked personally very, very hard on the accountability legislation in the last session. My colleague, Dick Swett, did also, and I complimented my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS. I think that bill was long overdue.

But there was not an opportunity for the minority to have a debate and a discussion about it. If we are to change this body, then in fact you are now in charge. The Republicans have the majority, so that with bills getting lost, the calendar becomes your calendar in terms of scheduling. If it is your side that has to say that for the sake of reform and openness and what we have talked about in this bill, then we have to have delay. Let the process be opened up so we can have a debate about a variety of issues.

That is the point I am trying to make, that we cannot portray change when in fact we are looking at business as usual. And I think we need to be very mindful and very careful about that as we go down the next several months.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman sounds just like JERRY SOLOMON.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to prepare to organize the Rules Committee. It is going to be a fair and open and accountable Rules Committee this year. So I am going to have to close this special order, and I thank the body for indulging me.

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF FAIRNESS ON THE FIRST DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the Minority Leader.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, for the general public and for all Members of the House, 435 of them, that were here—there may have been one or two absent—yesterday was a historic day. And it is kind of a humbling experience, even for myself—this was the tenth time I was sworn in— to realize that you are 1 of the 435 among all the people of the United States to be here and to be in this body and to assume the responsibilities of the office, to do everything you can to benefit not only your district and your State but the country, and do it well. Then, as a result, when you come to the Congress and after you are sworn in, you find that you are going to take up some changes in the rules, and when you review those, you find that you agree with a good many of them, and there are some that you yourself had generally agreed with, that we could reduce the size of our staffs here in the Congress—we have done that before—and we could reduce the size of our committees.

The last time we were in the Congress, we eliminated four select committees and we reduced the number of subcommittees. This is a continuation of that, and we agree that those things should be done.

But when you read the proposal that comes from the majority and from the gentleman who just preceded me in the special order, the gentleman from New York, for whom I have a great deal of respect, you find that for the first time—and it has been 18 years—for the first time you find that you have a substantive bill that is going to be brought up on the same day, and in that proposed rule change you find that it is a closed rule, that this bill, the Accountability Act or the compliance bill that makes the legislative branch of Government subject to those laws that all of our private businesses and industries and States, et cetera, are required to comply with. Then you find as to that bill, which is a very substantive bill, no amendments will be permitted to that bill.

I would like to read the language of that to everyone, because I know the people out there and, as is obvious to me, many Members of this body had not had the opportunity or at least had not taken the opportunity to review that language. This is what it says:

> It shall be in order at any time after the adoption of this resolution to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, the bill (H.R. 1) to make certain laws applicable to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, if offered by the majority leader or a designee. The bill shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the