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

majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. This previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, what that language I just read meant is that when this large, very important, very substantive bill was brought up, we in the minority were given 30 minutes to talk about it. But we were not given one opportunity, not one opportunity to change one word in this bill.

How, the majority has made a big to-do about this fact that they have given openness to this body and given fairness to this body. What is so fair to the 204 Members of the minority that not a one of them can offer 1 amendment to this bill?

□ 1130

I do not believe that that is very fair at all. In fact, I say that goes back to previous years in this House when we had what we call just strictly gag rules.

Every Member of this body, whether Republican or Democrat, comes here with ideas, because that is what government is all about. Whether it is your Declaration of Independence or the Constitution, whether it is all the laws of this land, at one time they were nothing more than an idea in someone's mind. And that idea was promoted by that person and finally was accepted through everybody, and they were put down in writing. Back when this country was founded, they took a pen and they wrote it down, and that went from there to printing presses, typewriters, and now we use the computers. But it all starts with an idea in the head.

Yet, when this bill was taken up early this morning, there was not one idea from a Democratic Member permitted to even be decided by the Members of this body.

I call on the new Speaker and my good friend the chairman of the Committee on Rules to ensure that in the subsequent days of this session and next session of this Congress that that not happen again. Because what it really means, and when he had these special orders I brought out to him, unless they are willing to bring another bill up with all the legislation that is going to be on the agenda, I do not anticipate that will occur.

That means that when this bill finally reaches the desk of the President of the United States, and it will because it is good legislation, that not one Member of the Democratic Party, not one Member of this minority, has had an idea incorporated in here that they would have liked to have seen included in this legislation. We will not have that opportunity.

Another thing that was not done that I think is very important in all the rules changes that were made, and most of them, except for one, as far as I am concerned, most of them were very beneficial to this body, but that does not mean that you cannot do a little better. And we could have done better.

You know, folks, one of the biggest problems in this body, and I have seen it and watched it and observed it since I have been here, is the influence of special interests over this body. If you went around in the halls and in the areas of this Capitol and the office buildings, even yesterday you would have seen the lobbyists around. I am sure that many Members had their dinner purchased yesterday. I am sure that within this nice winter day that we have here, that there are lobbyists proposing to take Members to nice trips and vacations, to nice warm climates, play some rounds of golf, pay the hotel bill and all that Member has to do is make a little talk.

There is nothing in this rules change that prohibits that whatsoever. Many of us feel that if we are to really clean up the House of Representatives, that we need to prohibit the influence of those special interests on this body. That legislation like lobbying reform, that at that time the majority party, the Democratic Party, last year passed overwhelmingly and sent to the Senate, where it was filibustered by the Senator from Kansas and others, where it was killed, we need that legislation. Yet that legislation, those rules changes, that would have prohibited these Members from taking these meals, from taking these trips, from taking the vacations, is not in here at all.

There is nothing in our rules today, nothing in the law. While we have people out in my district and all over this land freezing because they are too cold, because they cannot pay their heating bills, there is nothing in our rules that says that we cannot have Members going off to Jamaica, to the Virgin Islands, to the warm climates of Florida, Arizona, all paid by lobbyists at their expense, air fair, vacation. You want to go fishing out in the deep sea, we will pay for that. There is nothing in here that is going to prohibit that.

We need that. Yet yesterday, when the minority in their committal resolution offered to have that incorporated in our rules that would have prohibited that, the majority refused and voted overwhelmingly against that.

So I wonder how many of those, instead of being here with you and I today, are now being prepared to spend this nice weekend in a nice warm climate somewhere with some lobbyists, because they sure did not want that legislation yesterday to become part of the rules, because if it became part of the rules, they could not, would not be able to do it. I wonder how many in this next week, when we are not going to be working here, folks. You are not going to see anybody else on this floor. There is not going to be any more work this week, there will not be anything done next week. How many of them that voted against including lobby reform, gifts by special interests, vacations, and golf trips and what have you, how many of them are off on those trips in this next 10 days?

I am very disappointed that the majority has not—has not—included lobbying reform, has not included prohibiting those trips, those gifts, et cetera, in this legislation, and in fact strongly opposed it yesterday, spoke against it, and actually voted against it.

I think that I as a member, and as the general public, we should let the majority know in this body that you no longer feel that the lobbyists should have control of this body, that the lobbyists should be prohibited from giving gifts and vacations, et cetera, to Members of the House of Representatives.

□ 1140

The last thing in this rule that I would like to address is a matter that I opposed, and other Members opposed. That is that the provision—I would like to read it, because it was obvious to me yesterday during the debate on this limitation on tax increases that they had not read the proposed rule change.

As I listened to the Members from this side of the aisle, the majority, espousing the three-fifths requirement repeatedly, over and over, they said that ''We are not going to have tax increases anymore, because this rule says that you have to have a three-fifths vote required for tax increases, especially income tax increases.'' I say they have not read it, because it does not say that.

I would like to read it: ''No bill or joint resolution, amendment, or conference report carrying a Federal income tax''—and here is the key word, folks, and every one of them left it out, every one of them that spoke. I say you take that CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday when it comes out and you can read it. Not a one of them mentions it, the word ''rate.'' It is only the income tax rate increase shall be considered, unless by not less than three-fifths of the Members voting.

What does that mean? The rates on income tax only take up about two pages of the total Revenue Code of well over 1500 pages. That means you can change all the rest of the Revenue Code for income tax on a majority vote, not a three-fifths. You can deny everyone an exemption. What that means is if you have a husband, wife, and four children that are dependent, all of a sudden your taxable income just went up by about $15,000. That is a majority vote, that is not three-fifths.

As far as the average wage earner buying a house out there, it has a mortgage on it, now he takes a deduction on his income tax for that interest that he pays. Well, they can remove that if they wish to do so. They can remove your deduction for the taxes you pay, for the State taxes and property taxes you pay on that house by a majority vote, not three-fifths. I will

guarantee you, your taxes are going to go up.

What it means basically, this means, if you read it, it is a tax rate. What tax rate are we talking about? The top tax rate. That is 39 percent. Who does that apply to? That only applies to people making over $200,000. Those are the ones they are protecting. Those are the three-fifths that they have to vote on.

If you want to put it on the top people you have to do three-fifths, but if you want to put it on the little guy, if you want to put it on the middle income, you do not have to do that. You can do it by majority vote. Of, if you would rather, according to their rules, if you would rather change our whole tax system and go to the value added tax, the VAT, and really put it to the lower- and middle-income people, because that is what a VAT does, it really does, that is a majority vote. That is not three-fifths.

So when they say that we are going to require a three-fifths vote for tax increases, that is not right, folks. It is not even right for income tax. It is only the rate. That is what exactly it says. It says ''Federal income tax rate increase.'' It does not say ''a Federal income tax increase,'' it says ''a Federal income tax rate increase.''

So this Congress will not take a three-fifths vote. I question the constitutionality of it, as others did during the debate, but folks, that is the top rate. It is only the wealthy. If you want to increase their taxes, you have got to do a three-fifths, but if you want to increase the tax on the lower or middle income, you can do it by a majority.

That is what the Republican Party says. That is the new rule. That is the way they say they are going to protect those people.

Who are those people? You ought to look at their Federal election returns that they filed and see who gives them the money. You ought to take a look at the people who do the lobbying up here in Washington, DC, and take the Members for the trips. They are those people that have that high tax rate, so we are kind of giving them a guarantee with this rule that we are not going to touch them, and in return, maybe you just take some Members for a trip now and then, so everybody—the Member, he gets a trip, he gets some meals, he gets some freebies, and the lobbyist is not going to have his taxes increased. He is going to save a bunch of money.

That is basically a part of this rule that was done yesterday. What really amazed me during that whole debate, during that whole 20 minutes from this side when they discussed it, not once, not one Member, not even the Member from Pennsylvania, who was handling that section of the rule change, ever mentioned that it was only for income tax rate increase that we were requiring a three-fifths.

They kept saying it was on income tax raises, that you could not raise the income tax except for three-fifths. That is not right. That is not correct. They can raise the taxes on middle and low income with a majority vote. It just means that you do not raise on higher income, except by three-fifths.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for 60 minutes.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VOLKMER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VOLKMER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMP.
Mr. EMERSON in six instances.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. RICHARDSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1995, at 2 p.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 12. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the dollar limitation on the exclusion under section 911 of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees and to limit contributions in House of Representatives elections from persons other than individual in-State residents; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 14. A bill to repeal the exemption from disclosure requirement for municipal securities, and to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to public model disclosure forms to facilitate compliance with the disclosure requirements; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 15. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the appointment of the presidents of the Federal reserve banks by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 17. A bill to establish the Federal Bank Agency, to abolish the positions of the Comptroller of the Currency and Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, to consolidate and reform the regulation of insured depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 18. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing prudential framework for the affiliation of banks and securities firms; to the Committee on Banking & Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH and Mr. SCHUMER (for themselves, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 19. A bill to encourage foreign countries to accord national treatment to U.S. banking, securities, and insurance organizations that operate or seek to operate in those countries; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 20. A bill to provide a framework to improve risk management techniques at financial institutions, including the prudential use of derivative products; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 21. A bill to amend section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to more accurately determine the median income for Rockland County, NY, for purposes of housing programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 22. A bill to establish the position of Coordinator for Counterterrorism within the office of the Secretary of State; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a schedule of preventive health care services and to provide for coverage of such services