the Committee on Rules wrote this bill. We may as well not have committee hearings, and we did not have committee hearings.

Some say we had hearings. The two hearings that the opposition is pointing to were held before this bill or its predecessor bill was even introduced. There have been no hearings, none, not one, in this Congress on the assault weapon ban repeal, and the rule is more fitting of a dictatorship than a democracy.

Speaker GINGRICH is launching this sneak attack for one simple reason, because he knows the American people vehemently disagree with him, but he must kiss the ring of the NRA, and thus we have this shameful, shameful, shameful procedure.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a freshman Member of this body and one of the major sponsors of this legislation, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], a Democrat.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from New York talks about a sneak attack so that the people will not see it coming. People in this body know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] sees these things coming even when they are not coming. He knows fully when they are coming up, how they are coming up, and he marshals his forces better than any Member of this Congress when these issues come up.

This is hardly a sneak attack. This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that the American people know. This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this body, every one of the 435 Members of this body, every one of the 100 members of the other body, know backwards, and they know it forwards, they know it sideways. There is no single issue in this 104th Congress, or the 103d, or the 102d, Mr. Speaker, that is more well known, more fully debated than the issue of how to protect American citizens against crimes involving firearms.

The rule that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has come forward with, Mr. Speaker, has itself been fully debated. The issue has been fully debated at hearings.

My colleague from New York expresses great surprise and dismay that the bill which we are considering here today may have been introduced after the hearings. Mr. Speaker, is that not the best time to introduce a bill, after there have been hearings on the issue so that the bill can be crafted, fine-tuned and honed so that it reflects the input from citizens and from interest groups and from other Members as this legislation does?

The procedures in which we are about to embark today, Mr. Speaker, have been fully aired, are being fully aired, in the hallways, in this Chamber, in committee rooms, and in homes all across America. It is high time that this body stood up unafraid, unabashed, undefensive and said there is a better way to protect American citizens, to make sure that those people who cry out for protection are indeed protected. It is this legislation.

□ 1045

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] the hearings the gentleman is talking about had nothing to do with the bill that is on the floor today. Maybe the gentleman remembers it or maybe he forget it, but to represent that we have had these hearings, that this has been considered in the manner that the gentleman suggests, is not quite accurate, sir. That is why I take this time to point that out. Sorry the gentleman was not paying attention.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, there are not many times, but there are some times when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I agree. This is one of these times that I strongly agree, and I think just as strongly as the gentleman from New York on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks basically to those Members that were not here in August 1994 and September 1994, because those that were know how they voted and know why they voted, and basically it is the same vote. However, those who were not here in 1994 know that if they do not know much about guns, I think Members should educate themselves before they vote on this issue. I would like to help them just a little bit.

In the first place, these guns that were banned, the few semi-automatics that were banned are no different, are no different from the semi-automatic that I use every year that I go hunting for deer in Missouri in my district. They work the very same way. They just look different. They are no different, they are no different. They were in that same bill in 1994 that banned a few semi-automatics that they call assault weapons, that are not, Mr. Speaker, they are not. I can tell the Members why in a minute.

Look at that list. Those are the ones that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and all the other ones say, ''These are okay. These are fine.'' There are Uzis on there. Yes, there are Uzis on here. They are fine. There are all kinds of semi-automatics on here. Every one of them are semi-automatics. They are fine. The only difference is the way they look.

Mr. Speaker, I can take my deer rifle, and if I paint it black and if I put a metal folding stock on it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] would say that it should be banned because of the way it looks. The ones that were banned, all these semi-automatics, look bad. They look like they might be a military weapon, but they are not a military weapon.

I would just like to tell those Members that have not voted on this, Mr. Speaker, have no fear. What was done in 1994 in the crime bill has necessitated some of us to be here to fight to try and save other programs. But one thing that was done in 1994 in that crime bill that has not stopped any crime was the ban on semi-automatic rifles. It has not stopped any crime. The FBI will tell you, less than 1 percent of the crimes are used with these weapons.

I would like to ask the Members, what is the difference between a ball bat that is red and one that is black and one that is just plain clear wood? Is there any difference? I do not know of any difference. They all hit the ball. If you have the right batter, they can do home runs. Another batter might just hit a single, but they are all the same.

If I take that ball bat, that black one, it looks ugly. I should not let a batter use it because it is ugly. That is what the ban is all about, no different. Ball bats are all the same. These semi-automatic rifles are all the same, but the ones that have been banned, they just do not look good. That is why the gun banners say they should be banned.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS.]

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of rhetoric Members are going to get all day. We are going to constantly get the baseball bat analogy and a lot of other silliness, when the fact of the matter is that this list was shortened because of the people that support the NRA that made us shorten the list. We wanted a longer line. Now that we do not have it, well, it should be a lot longer. Why is it not a lot longer?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, who was in charge? He was not allowed, his Democrat leadership did not allow him?

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the most idiotic statement I have ever heard here. I really have. None of us had anything to do with this list. It was the proponents. There, the

gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentlewoman in the Senate, the gentlewoman from California, made up this list, nobody else. They did not have to have a list. They could have had every semiautomatic and tried to ban it. They would not have succeeded.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my opening remarks, I am yielding to Democrats on both sides of the issue. There are some Democrats who agree with this legislation and some who oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, this notion that we cannot make a difference because if we ban so many, we are not banning all of them, or if you cannot save all crime, you are not going to try to save any at all, is just bogus.

Our responsibility in this House is to do what we are able to do. That is our responsibility. If we are able to save anyone's life because we ban these weapons of war that spray bullets and kill people indiscriminately, then we should do so. I cannot believe in this House, a week after the kids were mowed down in Scotland, that you have the nerve to bring this bill up.

In the opening of this debate, you said we should have known about this bill before we were elected to the 104th Congress. I will tell you, we knew about this bill. Americans knew about this bill, my family knew about this bill. We did not have to read the NRA questionnaire to know about this bill. Families like mine all across this country know all too well what damage weapons can do, and you want to arm our people even more. You want to add more magazines to the assault weapons so they can spray and kill even more people.

Shame on you. What in the world are you thinking when you are opening up the debate on this issue? Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but a sham, to come on this floor and say you are going to have an open and fair debate about assault weapons. My God, all I have to say to you is, play with the devil, die with the devil.

There are families out there, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman will never know what it is like, because they do not have someone in their family killed. It is not the person who is killed, it is the whole family that is affected.

Furthermore, people will say, and I have heard this argument already, this is not effective because it is not cutting crime, you are not cutting crime. That is the wrong question. It is not about cutting crime, it is about cutting the number of people who get killed by these assault weapons. You are asking the wrong question. It is not about crime, it is about the families and victims of crime. That is what we are advocating, in prosposing this ban. That is why we should keep this ban in place.

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

Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves the floor, and I have a great respect for he and his family, but I am going to tell him something, when he stands up and questions the integrity of those of us that have this bill on the floor, the gentleman ought to be a little more careful. Let me tell you why.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Tell me why.

Mr. SOLOMON. My wife lives alone 5 days a week in a rural area in upstate New York. She has a right to defend herself when I am not there, and don't you ever forget it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. You know the facts about this. You have guns in the home that are going to be used against your own family members. You know what the evidence is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York has the time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Following the previous speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], who spoke so eloquently, I will agree, there was, I heard and I saw, because I turned and saw, there was applause and clapping in the galleries. We have rules in this House concerning that. I would like for the Chair to address the gallery and inform them of the rules of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House; that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BOB BARR, one of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker on the other side speaks very loudly, if not eloquently, but some of his analogies, some of his terms are rather confusing. He talks about the devil. The devil is the person with a gun in his hand who murders anybody in this country. That is the devil. That is the person to which this legislation today is aimed. It is the devil in Scotland who murdered 16 children and their teacher in a country that bans virtually every type of weapon, every type of handgun. That is no guarantee of anything. We must have this legislation to protect against exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, why are we here? It is murderously irresponsible for this House to take up this action today. There are only two forces in this country that want us to consider this measure: The National Rifle Association, and the Republican leadership of this House.

When I go back to my district, I go through the grocery stores and I do not have anybody stopping me and saying, ''Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BARRETT, we have to get those AK–47's back on the street.'' When I take my son to preschool, I do not have anybody saying, ''Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BARRETT, we have to get those Uzis back on the playgrounds.'' When I go to church, I do not have anybody stop me and say, ''We have to get those Tech–9's back in the hands of those criminals.''

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] talks about the devil, the devil does this. You can give the devil his due, but do not give the devil then an assault weapon. It is wrong to put those weapons into the arms of people who want to kill Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chance today to do what is right. We have a chance today to say to the NRA, take your money, take your money. We do not want it in our campaigns. You want to buy us, lock, stock, and barrel? No. We do not want your blood money, because it is murderously irresponsible to put AK–47's on the streets of America. It is murderously irresponsible to put Uzis on playgrounds in this country. It is murderously irresponsible to put street sweepers on Long Island trains.

Mr. Speaker, let us end this carnage. Let us end what happened in San Francisco. Let us end what happened in Long Island. Let us make sure that we do not have a Scotland situation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, to do that, we only have to do one thing today. That is to say no to the NRA. It is something that 70 percent of the people in this country want us to do, and it is something that every single Member of this body should do today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Albuquerque, NM, Mr. STEVE SCHIFF, one of the most qualified men to serve in this body because of his prior experience before he came, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the bill.

During the period of time I have been in the U.S. Congress, I have voted both for and against gun control. I have found each vote to be inherently controversial, because this is a very difficult issue. I have, however, never seen an issue in which there was so much misinformation being cast about. I

think there are two serious areas of information about the kinds of weapons we are talking about here.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, they are not assault weapons. Assault weapons are automatic weapons; that means a machinegun or submachinegun; pull the trigger, and the gun continues to fire for as long as it has bullets. Indeed, I have seen national news programs where they are talking about this bill, and they are showing the public fully automatic weapons.

Not one of the weapons we are talking about in this bill is an assault weapon. Not one of the weapons we are talking about in this bill is an automatic weapon. They are not AK–47's and Uzis of the automatic type. But that is what the public has been told over and over again, and would like to believe.

The fact is that each of these firearms shoots one bullet with one pull of the trigger. There is no functional difference between any of the firearms that are mistakenly, I think deliberately, mistakenly called assault weapons in this bill, and weapons which are not called assault weapons. In fact, the way this bill describes assault weapons, or I should say, real assault weapons, real automatic weapons, machineguns, submachineguns, have been regulated for decades, and I think they ought to be.

□ 1100

I do not propose to change that. The weapons we are talking about here are called assault weapons mistakenly based upon their appearance.

For example, if a certain rifle has the ability to carry a bayonet, under this existing legislation that makes it an assault weapon. I invite the next speaker who is speaking against our bill and in favor of the current legislation to explain how if a weapon can carry a bayonet it is somehow more lethal as a firearm. But none of the speakers for the legislation are going to talk about that because they want to mislead the American people into believing we are talking about something different than bayonets. But that is exactly what we are talking about.

I was a career prosecutor before I had the privilege of being elected to the House of Representatives, and during all the years I was prosecuting criminals, none of them ever led a bayonet charge.

So I hope it can be explained rationally why saying that a bayonet on a weapon or the ability to carry a bayonet should make it illegal.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 percent with the gentleman that it has been a misstatement all along that these are assault weapons.

I do not believe that even the opponents of the legislation, the proponents of the ban, would ever think about sending our troops into Bosnia and all around the world with this type of weapon.

In every place they go, even in Third-World countries, they are going to be outfought in any firefight because those people have real assault weapons. Those are the automatics. None of these are automatics.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is exactly correct. The misimplication is being made that these are automatic weapons, that these are machineguns and submachine guns. It just is not true.

They are weapons that have certain visual characteristics like in being able to carry a bayonet which has no meaning as a firearm but that is what makes it illegal under the current legislation, which makes no sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring up one other issue that I think has been confused, and, that is, statistics about how often these weapons as opposed to other firearms are used in the commission of a crime.

I asked Director Magaw that question in a letter several months ago. He is Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. He responded that the U.S. Government does not keep official records of how many of the weapons they are calling assault weapons are used in crimes, so he could give me no information. Yet 2 days ago, I saw in USA Today the statement that the ATF says that 10 percent of all violent crimes use these weapons. Apparently that came from some group that supports the current legislation giving that information to a reporter.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms denies that statement. They do not support it.

And so there is no credible information being kept about whether these firearms are used in crimes any more than any other kind of firearm. Of course since they all shoot the same, they are all going to function the same, anyway. But I think it is significant to note that an administration that says these firearms are more deadly than other firearms does not keep official records of are they used in crimes.

I think there is a place for gun control in crime fighting. The best law we have on the books is a law that has been on the books for many years. It is a Federal crime for a convicted felon to have possession of a firearm, any firearm. It does not matter what kind. But that law has not been strongly enforced by this administration or by the last two administrations.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have tried to get the Clinton administration to agree to prosecute all convicted felons found in possession of a firearm. They refuse to do it.

As a member of Judiciary, I then tried to get the Clinton administration to set a minimum standard to say, for example, that if a convicted felon was released in the last year from a penitentiary for a violent crime, then if that person is caught with a firearm, guarantee to prosecute that person. They refuse to guarantee it.

We have two suspects for a horrendous series of five homicides. Every homicide is horrendous, but we have five homicides in which we have two suspects. Both of these suspects were recently released from the penitentiary. Both of these suspects were in the possession of firearms, and these are the kinds of people that the Federal Government will not prosecute until it is too late. They should be prosecuted when they are found with a firearm.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of repealing this ban.

There is a lot of emotion to this argument and justifiably and understandably so. I think there also need to be some facts and some statistics if you are going to write policy in the halls of this House.

There is a lot of reference to Scotland, a tragedy that is seared in the minds of all of us. Let us talk about Scotland for a second. Great Britain has some of the tightest and most restrictive gun control laws in the world. Great Britain requires a permit for any type of firearm. In Scotland, the person who committed those atrocities was apparently carrying four handguns, not the type of firearm at all at issue on the floor of this House. That person had been issued permits despite the fact that he had clear mental problems.

There are some times you cannot control it. That is what happened in Scotland. But that should not be an issue here on this floor.

The reason I support repealing this ban, I guess are the same reasons I made when I argued against the ban 2 years ago. This is not what you need to fight crime.

The statistics are quite clear on this. If you want to look at the FBI or the Bureau of Justice statistics, this type of firearm at most is used in 3 percent and most say around 1 percent of all crimes.

Does anyone really feel there has been a significant difference because these firearms are statistically or theoretically banned? I do not think so.

If this has been so effective, then there must have been a wave of prosecutions against those who manufacture or possess or transfer these firearms. How many prosecutions have there been since 1994, since this was passed? One. One prosecution pending today in this country. That is not in my State or in your State. For the entire country.

My concern with this legislation is it is cosmetic, that this ban on so-called assault weapons is cosmetic. Two firearms that shoot the same bullet at the same speed, the same velocity with the same impact. And they are semiautomatic. That means that they fire a bullet with each pull of the trigger.

They are not machineguns. They are not automatic. They are semiautomatic. Yet one is banned and one is not. That is cosmetic legislation and we do not need it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the different speakers all talk about different statistics, one saying one thing, another person saying another thing. That is why I am so disappointed that we have this rule on the floor and we are voting on the issue without having public hearings. We are not experts in law enforcement. The experts in law enforcement should have had an opportunity to come before this Congress and give us their best information as to how the assault weapon ban is working, so that we could vote intelligently on the subject so we could have that debate in our committees where we should have it.

What are we afraid of? Bringing the experts before us?

The assault weapon ban is a reasonable attempt at trying to get weapons out of the hands of people who want to cause harm and kill our citizens. It is a reasonable effort to have less guns on the street, less assault weapons on the street. It has saved lives and will continue to save lives.

It represents a minimal inconvenience to law-abiding citizens, a minimal inconvenience to save lives on the streets. It was a reasonable effort.

In my State of Maryland, we have statistics from our law enforcement people showing it has worked, that it has reduced the number of crimes in Baltimore. It has worked with State laws that we have passed working together to try to get guns out of the hands of criminals. That is what this is about.

It is beyond me that we want to in a couple of hours repeal the assault weapon ban without giving the public an opportunity to be heard on the subject as to the specific legislation that we have before us. That is not what this legislation is all about. That is not what this Congress is all about.

If we differ on the underlying facts, why do we not have the public hearings before this Congress in order to get the facts before us before we are called upon to vote?

I think we all understand the reason why we are not going to be afforded that opportunity. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

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

This bill before us does two things. Yes, it repeals a gun ban; but, yes, it increases penalties for those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of a violent Federal crime. The reason that language is in here is because of two Members, one named FRED HEINEMAN of North Carolina but primarily this gentleman I am going to introduce, JON CHRISTENSEN of Omaha, NE. His bill the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act, contains this legislation. It is because of him that it is in here today. I commend him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. It is with that that I rise today in strong support of this rule, this balanced rule that I believe will send a strong message to those criminals in America who continue to prey upon our citizens.

I believe that this debate will let us focus on the real answer, and, that is, that getting tougher on those that prey upon our society will not be tolerated any longer.

Just last week I introduced H.R. 3085, the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act of 1996, which made it clear that anyone who commits a felony with a gun should plan on spending the next few decades behind bars, no exceptions.

While my bill provided for stiffer mandatory penalties than the measure which we will be debating shortly, it does include my language that takes it from a serious Federal violent crime to all Federal violent crimes and all drug-related crimes. By adding stiffer penalties, though, for the crimes committed with guns, we will be able to keep those who prey upon our society behind bars for a long, long time instead of being freed by the slick criminal trial lawyers who allow these slugs of society to walk our streets because of legal technicalities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for allowing us to focus in on the real answer to crime, because I do not believe that gun control is crime control. But this rule today will allow us to really focus in on what I believe will be an answer to America's problems.

I urge the passage of both this rule and this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from nearly 100 police chiefs and sheriffs in California begging the Congress not to repeal the assault weapons ban. It occurs to me that the police chiefs and the sheriffs know a whole lot more about this than the politicians in this House who have received contributions from the NRA and who are doing the bidding of their funders.

The police do not want to face off against assault weapons on the street, but I think if we vote for this assault weapon ban repeal, we are saying it is OK for the police to face off against criminals with assault weapons in the course of their jobs.

Earlier in this Congress we passed the Congressional Accountability Act that said we would live by the same rules as those we passed for other Americans. So as we consider this bill, what is missing in this rule is an amendment to remove the metal detectors from the U.S. Capitol. Let us see how we like having citizens armed with assault weapons in our gallery. We should do that if we ask police officers to live with assault weapons.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and H.R. 125 which would repeal the assault weapons ban. There is absolutely no good reason for Congress to repeal this ban. It is needed, it works, and the American people support it.

More than one-third of all police killed with guns from January 1994 to September 1995 were slain by illegal assault weapons. Although these assault weapons account for only 1 percent of privately owned firearms in the United States, they are 8 times more likely to be used in crime than other guns.

That is why police chiefs in my district, James Goulart of Belmont, CA; Lucy Carlton of Los Altos; Dennis Wick of Half Moon Bay; and Cliff Gerst of the San Carlos police department oppose this legislation. Poll after poll demonstrates broad support for the assault weapons ban by the American people.

Talk about a beltway mentality. You are not paying attention to the American people. This is a march to folly. Barbara Tuckman was right. Oppose the rule, oppose the legislation.

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have got a lot of new Members in this body, and they are all young and they are out there, and they are real fighters. One of those is this gentleman.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

I listened to a very impassioned speech from my office from my fellow colleague freshman from Rhode Island, and I had to come down and speak to the fact that I totally agree with one of the points that he made, and that is that this Congress must do what it can do to end these violent crimes in America.

But that is just the point. What can this Congress do? Well, there are things that Congress can do, and there are things explicitly placed in our Constitution that speak of those things that Congress cannot do. Specifically, the second amendment to the Constitution, which says this, and I quote, ''A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.''

What this, what a majority in this House, did in 1994 and what this Government did in 1994 is did what the Constitution said it cannot do. It infringed on the right of people to keep and bear arms.

Today I ask for my colleagues' support on this rule and on this bill so that we can undo what this Government did in 1994, what the Constitution said that it cannot do.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled.

We knew that the extreme Republicans made promises to their special interest friends. We knew that the NRA has too much influence over this Republican Congress.

But I could not believe that it was this bad. I could not believe that that this body would endanger innocent lives.

Republicans say they want to fight crime. Instead, they fight to put military weapons into the hands of common thugs.

This bill means that more police officers will sacrifice their lives to defend our homes—our neighborhoods—our communities. This bill means that more innocent children will be gunned down in our Nation's streets.

Our families will give their lives to pay the debt Republicans owe their special interest friends. The NRA and their money cannot bring back the lives that will be lost—sacrificed to their extreme agenda.

Reject this radical, this dangerous, this sick, and obscene proposal.

These weapons are weapons and tools of death, violence, and destruction.

Reject this proposal.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], one of the most respected members of this entire body.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the measure before the House.

I rise today to voice my full and absolute support for the repeal of President Clinton's gun ban instituted in 1994. I have anxiously awaited this opportunity to restore the second amendment rights of all Americans, which were unjustifiably stripped away by one of the worst laws this country has ever seen. The Constitution deserves far more respect than it was afforded when the Clinton gun ban was signed into law, and today Congress can and must reaffirm one of the fundamental ideals which form the bedrock of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it's past time that we junked the laws that sully and undermine our second amendment liberties, which our forebears knew to be a fundamental part of a free society. Just as free speech, free religion, and other guarantees are essential to the future of a free people, so too is the freedom to keep and bear arms. All contribute to the protection of an individual's basic right to life and liberty.

The Clinton gun ban is another example of mistaking gun control with crime control. There is a problem with guns in this country, but that problem does not involve law-abiding citizens and sportsmen. The problem is with criminals who trample on our laws and continue to threaten our neighborhoods. These are the individuals who must pay for their offenses and their complete disregard for the laws of our society—not the good people in southern Missouri and throughout America. This legislation provides the much needed penalties to punish and deter criminal activity.

I would also like to take a minute to set the record straight on the so-called assault weapons targeted by the 1994 law. The firearms affected by this law are not at all the extra lethal, military-grade instruments that gun ban advocates would have you believe. They are not machineguns and they do not spray bullets. The term assault rifle is nothing more than misleading rhetoric generated by the anti-gun lobby and the liberal media. Fact is, there is no functional difference between the semi-automatic firearms prohibited by the Clinton law and those that are exempted. The reality is that the gun ban is a part of an effort to establish even more stringent controls on firearms that are appropriately and legitimately owned by Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation in order to return to the people of this country the second amendment rights to which they are entitled. We need to hold true to the great legacy of our Founding Fathers, and make sure that constitutional principles are preserved.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VALÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep disgust with the extremist tactics of the Republican majority. Their drive-by method of bringing this repeal to the floor is the height of irresponsibility.

You should be ashamed of yourselves, letting the NRA pistol whip you again. Stop playing election year politics with people's lives.

Without the assault weapons ban our city streets will become killing fields. Police officers, like the two ambushed in New York City yesterday, will be cut down in the line of fire. Children's hopes and dreams will be dashed by a spray of bullets. Their blood will be on your hands.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of this vote is that the IRA is collecting its GOP IOU. But, today's sneak attack on the American people will not go unanswered. Rest assured, next November voters will make a very special payback to those who turned on them. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, every single rule the House has adopted this session has been a restrictive rule; you heard that correctly, the Republican House has so far adopted 100 percent restrictive rules in this session. And if it is adopted, the rule before us will leave that 100 percent purely restrictive rules record intact.

This is the 63d restrictive rule reported out of the Rules Committee this Congress.

In addition, 75 percent of the legislation considered this session has not been reported from committee—9 out of 12 measures brought up this session have been unreported.

I include the following material for the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) od rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H.Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 Of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. *RULE AMENDED*.	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(l)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl 7 of rule XVI and cl 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl 2(l)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing get priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5© of rule XXI (⅗ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A.
H.R. 2491 H. Con. Res. 109	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all pints of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5© of rule XXI (⅗ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule; Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2(l)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res.	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate.	N/A.
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H.Res. 303	Open; waives cl 2(l)(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min).	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed; makes in order three resolutions; H.R. 2770 (Dorman), H.Res. 302 (Buyer), and H.Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H.Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H.Res. 309	Closed; provides 2 hours of general debate in the House	N/A.
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H.Res. 313	Open; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed; consideration in the House; self-executes Young amendment	N/A.
		PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION		
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. ** NR.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 134 H. Con. Res. 131	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed; provides to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 134 with the Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment (H. Con. Res. 131) which is self-executed in the rule. The rule provides further that the bill shall not be sent back to the Senate until the Senate agrees to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 131. ** NR.	N/A.
H. R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speakers table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the house the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous quesetion is considered as ordered. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed; ** NR	N/A.
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill; 2 hrs of general debate; makes in order a committee substitute as original text and waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order only the 16 amends printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; circumvents unfunded mandates law; Chairman has en bloc authority for amends in report (20 min.) on each en bloc..	5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H.Res 368	Open rule; makes in order the Hyde substitute printed in the Record as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority; vacates the House action on S. 219 and provides to take the bill from the Speakers table and consider the Senate bill; allows Chrmn. Clinger a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the text of H.R. 994 as passed by the House (1 hr) debate; waives germaneness against the motion; provides if the motion is adopted that it is in order for the House to insist on its amendments and request a conference.	N/A.
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.	H.Res 371	Closed rule; gives one motion to recommit, which if it contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H.Res. 372	Restrictive; self-executes CBO language regarding contingency funds in section 2 of the rule; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; Lowey (20 min), Istook (20 min), Crapo (20 min), Obey (1 hr); waives all points of order against the amendments; give one motion to recommit, which if contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	2D/2R.
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of orer against the amendments; gives Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) on enblocs; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 735. ** NR.	6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill and amendments in the report except for those arising under sec. 425(a) of the Budget Act (unfunded mandates); 2 hrs. of general debate on the bill; makes in order the committee substitute as base text; makes in order only the amends in the report; gives the Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) of debate on the en blocs; self-executes the Smith (TX) amendment re: employee verification program.	12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed; provides for the consideration of the CR in the House and gives one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader; the rule also waives cl 4(b) of rule XI against the following: an omnibus appropriations bill, another CR, a bill extending the debt limit. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.	H. Res. 388	Closed; self-executes an amendment; provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session. 92% restrictive; 8% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress 63% restrictive; 37% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ****** 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 rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. FROST. To date 9 out of 12 bills considered under rules in the 2d session of the 104th Congress, or 75 percent, have been considered under an irregular procedure which circumvents the standard committee procedure. They are as follows: H.R. 1643, to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment [MFN] to the products of Bulgaria; House Joint Resolution 134, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996; H.R. 1358, conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, MA; H.R. 2924, the Social Security Guarantee Act; H.R. 3021, to guarantee the continuing full investment of social security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States; H.R. 3019, a further down payment toward a balanced budget; H.R. 2703, the Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996; House Joint Resolution 165, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996; and H.R. 125, the Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there are pictures now, there are 19 specific weapons that are restricted by the existing legislation. What I want people in this Chamber and I want people who are watching on TV to look at, which of these guns are used for hunting, maybe it is the Steyr Aug., which is one of the weapons. You can take a look at it for yourself. Is that a weapon used for hunting? Maybe it is the Fabrique Nationale, which is another one. Maybe that is a weapon used for hunting. Maybe it is the Tec-9 or the AK–47 or the Uzi or the Street Sweeper.

You know, sometimes, I mean, look for yourself, America, this is what we are talking about today. This is what we are talking about today. These are not weapons that people use for hunting. In fact, if you use one of these weapons for hunting, you could not eat the animal because the animal would not exist anymore.

Who uses these weapons? Drug dealers, terrorists, the scum of our society. That is who my Republican colleagues are protecting today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, ''Leave it alone.'' That is what the majority of Americans are saying. If we allow this issue to rise from the dead, it will kill people. There is one reason to prefer this ban: Criminals prefer assault weapons. That is their weapon of choice in killing cops, one-third of whom are killed by assault weapons. That is their weapon of choice. It is 8 times more likely to be used in a crime.

The difference between this ban and a pitiful substitute provision of the majority is interesting to note. The ban has brought an 18-percent decrease in the use of these weapons. The majority wants us to use mandatory prison terms, after killing a cop, after killing individuals, then put them in jail for as long as you can keep them.

The ban says, ''Get the guns before they get us.'' Do not leave it until after-the-fact remedies. Get them now. They are trying to get us even as I speak.

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

You know, everything we hear on that side of the aisle is you know, ''Get the guns, take the guns away.'' Well, let me tell you something, if we taught some discipline to these children as they were growing up and as they become young adults, maybe we would not have these problems.

Let us get some family values back. Let us let these parents do their job. Do not take guns away from law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], one of the original sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank by colleague from New York for yielding me this time.

I do find it somewhat ironic that in the middle of this debate we hear from the gentlewoman, whom I admire greatly, from Washington, DC, who represents a jurisdiction which has banned handguns for a generation yet continues to suffer under one of the highest murder rates, the highest assault rates in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to educate those watching this debate today. I have to my left a chart which contains two pictures unadulterated, nothing magical here, two guns, guns that are absolutely identical in terms of their firing power, their firing mechanism, absolutely identical. Whatever this one can do, this one can do likewise. Why? Because they are the same gun. What then makes this gun a good gun, according to the proponents of the Clinton gun ban and our opponents here today and this one a bad gun, according to the proponents of the Clinton-Schumer gun ban and the opponents of our legislation here today?

It is not anything that has to do with its lethalness. It is not anything to do with its firepower. It is not anything to do with its accuracy. It is not anything to do with how many times or how quickly somebody can squeeze off two rounds or more. It has to do with the Dianne Feinstein syndrome, and that is it looks mean. It looks different, and therefore it must be different; it must be more lethal, it must be more dangerous, it must be more deadly.

This illustrates, Mr. Speaker, probably more than any other words can, the ridiculousness of the arguments on the other side. If indeed the arguments on the other side and those making those arguments were truly consistent, were truly honest about their real agenda here, they would be trying to ban both guns because if this one is dangerous, then this one must be dangerous too because it is exactly the same gun. Of course, they are not saying that, or are they?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this political payoff to the gun lobby. At a time when hard-working families across America are struggling against the tougher odds, this Congress should be focusing on their interests and not on special interests.

Since NEWT GRINGRICH took over this Congress, he has been paying off political IOU's. They allowed the pollution lobbyists to rewrite our Nation's environmental laws, then they rammed through their Medicare cuts to pay off their political contributors, and now they want to put assault weapons back on the streets of this Nation because the gun lobby is calling in its chits.

My constituents and my police officers in Connecticut say to me in no uncertain terms, assault weapons do not belong in the hands of drug dealers and street thugs. Say ''no'' to the gun lobby, say ''no'' to the special interests, and say ''no'' to this political payoff. Support the ban on assault weapons.

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

I am not going to have the gentlewoman's words taken down. She came very close to it when she says the Speaker of this House is paying off. That means a political bribe. Let us be a little careful. Let us keep it up here. Otherwise I can stand up and say, why is President Clinton vetoing the product liability bill? Because of a payoff to the trail lawyers of this Nation? We do not need to get into those kinds of conversations. Let us stick to the subject here.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think the record speaks for itself. Why else would we be here, because between January 1993 and November 1994, the NRA donated $308,000 in soft money contributions to the Republican National Committee.

□ 1130

Now, these Republican freshmen that were going to shake up the place, well, they demanded this vote today. Guess what? The NRA donated $235,000 in special interest PAC money to House freshmen in the 1993–94 election cycle. That was 44 percent of the total NRA contributions from PAC's.

The NRA gave large PAC contributions to four of the five House freshmen appointed by Speaker GINGRICH to his firearms legislation task force.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA donated $1,853,000 in PAC contributions, 78 percent going to Republicans.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA spent $1.5 million on independent expenditures, $1.2 which went to support Republican candidates.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA spent $1.93 million in communications costs to support Republican candidates.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here.

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

Mr. Speaker, well, sometimes I wonder how much the gentleman that just spoke, how much he might get from the trial lawyers. I would ask him, does that affect his vote?

I do not think so. The man is a man of integrity.

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

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very, very obvious why we are here. These guys have taken millions and millions of dollars from special interest PAC's.

Mr. Speaker, the whole country is watching this debate. The whole country is watching it. Seventy percent of the American people are opposed to this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not kidding anyone. The gentleman stands up and says that 73 percent of it went to Republicans. What happened to the 27 percent? Is he questioning the integrity of the other side of the aisle?

Mr. Speaker, let me get back on the subject. I would like to respond to a few comments that have been made about this rule. It is very important, since we are nearing the end of the debate. I would refer this to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] because he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and some others have brought up the subject.

First, this rule is similar to the rule provided in the last Congress for consideration of the bill that banned certain semiautomatic weapons. It is almost identical to the one when they were in power. That rule, House Resolution 416, I think sponsored by, I do not know if Mr. FROST carried it or Mr. BEILENSON, provided for consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and further provided, and I quote, because I want the gentleman to listen to this, ''No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and no other amendment to the bill shall be in order.''

Thas is exactly what we have here on the floor today. I do not say that the Democrats were right 2 years ago, and I do not say we are right today.

I would just like to respond further, like this rule, the rule in the last Congress provided for ''one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.'' You have exactly the same opportunity that you gave us 2 years ago. So in both instances, opponents of the bill will be allowed the opportunity to offer one final amendment, or alternative, before the final passage vote.

Second, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] is he on the floor? Where is my good friend? There he is, over there. The gentleman testified before the Committee on Rules he would like to be able to offer a motion to strike, what was it, section 4? Section 4 from the bill, only if we allowed other amendments to be offered.

Now, to quote my good friend, ''Otherwise he was satisfied with an up or down vote.'' That is exactly what we have given my good friend. I gave him exactly what he asked for.

I would just add that he will still have the right to offer the motion to strike under the motion to recommit with instructions permitted under this rule. You can still do this, you or anyone else.

Third, the gentleman from Michigan, where he is, my good friend over there, Mr. CONYERS, now the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, complained this bill was not reported from any committee. That is true. We

know that. But I would also observe for the RECORD that when the gentleman from Michigan was chairman, what was that committee you were chairman of before last year, oh, Committee on Government Operations, in the last Congress, he allowed, our good friend Mr. CONYERS allowed his committee to be discharged of a number of unreported bills that were considered by the House. The same situation here. No difference.

These included, and just in case you are writing up there, you know, these included a whole host of bills, H.R. 1578, H.R. 4600, both which provided for an expedited rescission process. Never reported from any committee. H.R. 3400, the Reinventing Government Act; H.R. 4604, to establish direct spending targets; H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control Act. Really? The Violent Crime Control Act; and H.R. 4907, the Full Budget Disclosure Act.

So the gentleman is well familiar with the practice of bringing unreported bills to the floor from his own committee when he was the chairman, and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], who has been on the Committee on Rules as long as I have, if not longer, was there and voted to do just that.

As I indicated in the Committee on Rules yesterday, I fully expect that most of these bills we bring to this floor will be reported by a committee. You all know that I believe in the committee system, and I am going to do my best to make sure that they are. But there will be occasions in the future, as there have been in the past, under Democrat control and under Republican control, when unreported bills will be brought to the floor.

The House always has a right to determine whether or not we are going to pass this rule. If you do not like it, vote it down. But I am going to tell you something, and I have to say it from my heart, I served for 16 years in the minority. I was gaged. I could not get these product liability reform bills, medical malpractice, my flag amendment. I could not get any of these things on the floor. I was gagged.

So if we are in some kind of a rush now, I apologize, but we have got so much to do in such a short time. Maybe that is what this is all about.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] who wanted to correct the RECORD on one point.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, for my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] I have never taken any political action committee money. Maybe you should try it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, why not take a poll of everybody on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] only 15 percent of the rules in the last Congress involved bills that were taken away from committees, whereas we are talking about 75 percent in this session.

Second, when the assault weapons ban was brought to the floor last Congress, it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went through the committee process. This repeal has not gone through the committee process. That was the point I was making.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I do not question the motives on either side. Both sides make a point. The second amendment was not drafted to protect duck hunting. On the other hand, strapping a Stinger missile on your back and citing a second amendment right is a little extreme here, folks.

I think we need some balance, and the charges of politics are always amusing to me. This is not Kiwanis and Democrats; they gained the majority over these votes last year. Now, I support the limited ban. I am going to continue to support the limited ban.

But the problem in America today is we have the NRA on one side and the police on the other, and they are both good guys, they are separate and apart. And no matter what law you pass, nothing good can come from it until we bring both good guys together.

I am disappointed that my amendment, which would have created a commission to bring the NRA in, the police in, and the Congress in, to fashion out some understanding of a law we might all live with, that America can live with. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that you look at that in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I am going to support a limited ban, but if we do not bring the NRA and the police together, you are whistling Dixie here.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, this is something we have tried to do, and the NRA has refused.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Palm Beach, FL [Mr. FOLEY], another outstanding new Member of this body, who represents part of my old hometown, Okeechobee.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Is it not a Democratic sponsor of the base bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is a very honorable Member, too, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JIM CHAPMAN.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is a lot of debate and the accusation is it is the Republicans selling out to the NRA. But it is a Democratic sponsor. The Republican leadership has allowed a Democratic bill on the floor for debate.

First of all, let us make a point, folks. Guns do not kill the people, it is who is behind the trigger that kills the person. We keep trying to blame inanimate objects for crime.

A serious problem in America, child abuse, physical and sexual abuse is going on; not created by a weapon; destruction of our children nonetheless.

Let us work together in this Chamber to stop crimes, get after the perpetrators, bring swift justice, quit death row appeals time and time again, Wayne Gacey, 20 years, $5 million of appeals, on death row, killed 33 young people. Not with a machine gun, not with a knife, he killed 30 young men. $5 million on death row appeals.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation to repeal the current ban on the manufacture or sale of assault weapons.

This is truly a sad day for the House of Representatives. Traditionally, it has been the sole prerogative and duty of the Speaker to schedule legislation for consideration on the floor of the House. But today, our schedule is under the control of an outside interest—the National Rifle Association.

No hearings were held on this legislation, there was no committee markup and we were only given 1 day's notice that the bill was being brought to the floor. But we do not really need a hearing record or a committee report to accompany this bill because we are not here to serve in our constitutional role as Federal legislators. Today is nothing more than a payback to the powerful and PAC-rich NRA. The new majority promised them a vote. And today they get it.

Mr. Speaker, as a former New York City police officer, I know how extraordinarily dangerous these weapons are. And let's be very clear. Assault weapons are not used to hunt game or for normal recreational purposes. Quite simply, assault weapons are designed and used to kill human beings—all too often police officers. That is why every major police organization is strongly opposed to this legislation.

Proponents of this legislation who are hiding behind the second amendment should be ashamed. The second amendment protects the right of Americans to keep and bear arms. It does not guarantee every drug lord or street thug easy access to cop killing semi-automatic assault weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, the people's House. Let's return it to them by overwhelmingly rejecting this hideous legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called ban has been neither the Armageddon for gun owners that was predicted during last

year's debate nor the panacea for the problem of violent crime in America predicted by the advocates. The truth is, it did not ban much of anything, not the sale, only the future manufacture of a few weapons, chosen for cosmetic reasons. And even if it was not a real ban, have we not learned that prohibition does not work well in America? That is it.

I did not support the ban, because I said it would have little or no effect, it was symbolic; nor will I support the repeal here today and trigger an endless series of debates on this issue, while this House avoids the real debate on the real issues that bring violent crime to the streets of America.

Where are the 100,000 new cops? The majority will not give us the 100,000 new police in America. They say we cannot afford it. Where are the prevention programs, so we do not have another generation of dangerous criminals in America? They have been eliminated by the new majority.

Those are the things we should be debating here today on the floor, and this debate distracts from that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the repeal of the ban. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, 3 years ago at 101 California Street, a mad gunman using an assault weapon went in and, in a matter of seconds, snuffed out the lives and futures of many young people in a law firm there. And now the Republican leadership wants to repeal the ban that so many of the victims of that assault worked so hard for.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership in this House talks a good act about caring about victims' rights. I do, too. We all talked about it a great deal in the course of the crime bill. Where are they when it comes to victims' rights when we are talking about the assault weapons? The victims of all of these assaults have called out, crusaded for this ban. I have here a long list, Mr. Speaker, not only of the victims but of the law enforcement agencies, the California State Sheriffs' Association, the California Police Chiefs' Association, lists and lists and lists of police departments and sheriffs' departments from across the State of California, the medical community, religious organizations, victims, and their families.

Mr. Speaker, in public opinion surveys, 72 percent of the people of California support the ban. So I say to these people, how do we explain to them why my colleagues are bringing this repeal to the floor, a repeal that the President has said he will veto? You tell me how I can explain to Michelle Scully, who lost her husband. Shall I just tell her that Members could not say no to the National Rifle Association?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 3 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would come over here and just talk to my good friends on this side of the aisle. This bill, the rule here, brings a bill before us that does two things. It, first of all, repeals the ineffective ban on certain semiautomatic weapons, but more importantly, it increases the penalties on those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of a violent crime or Federal drug trafficking, which is even more important.

The ban, my friends, on these semiautomatic weapons has not been effective at all, and let me tell you why. No one has been prosecuted under this 1½-year-old statute. No one has been prosecuted. Fewer than three people have been prosecuted for violating the statute's semiautomatic firearms ban. Listen to this. More than 85 percent of the semiautomatic weapons firearms banned under this 1994 law are rifles, and yet the type of firearms that are least used in committing crimes are rifles. Think about that.

Mr. Speaker, according to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, rifles of any description, including those this law defines as so-called assault weapons, which they are not, they are deer rifles, are used in less than 3 percent of the homicides, in the murders in this country. Less than 3 percent.

Banning guns does not reduce violent crime, you know it and I know it. Prosecuting violent criminals and putting them behind bars is the only proven method for controlling violent crime, and you know that and I know that, too. States with the highest crime imprisonment rates are among the States with the greatest decreases in violent crime. You think about that. The States you come from, if you have tough laws that put people in jail for committing crimes, you have less crime than the other States.

Mr. Speaker, the inescapable conclusion is that the way to stop crime is to put criminals in prison, not take away the rights of law-abiding citizens. I resent it. As I mentioned before, I am here in Washington 5 days a week. I live in rural New York up in the mountains, and my wife has the right to defend herself. She has the right to have weapons in her house. All these little feet in the door are attempts to take away those rights. That is why we need to repeal this ban and we need to stiffen the laws against these people, these inhumane, indecent people that would take other people's lives.

Come over here and vote for this rule, and then vote to repeal the ban and vote to stiffen the penalties on those people that commit crimes with guns.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 166, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—244

Allard	Ensign	LoBiondo
Archer	Everett	Longley
Armey	Ewing	Lucas
Bachus	Fawell	Manzullo
Baker (CA)	Fields (TX)	Mascara
Baker (LA)	Foley	McCollum
Ballenger	Forbes	McCrery
Barcia	Fowler	McDade
Barr	Franks (CT)	McHugh
Barrett (NE)	Frisa	McInnis
Bartlett	Frost	McIntosh
Barton	Funderburk	Metcalf
Bass	Gallegly	Meyers
Bateman	Gekas	Mica
Bevill	Geren	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Molinari
Bliley	Goodlatte	Mollohan
Boehner	Goodling	Montgomery
Bonilla	Gordon	Murtha
Bono	Goss	Myrick
Boucher	Graham	Nethercutt
Brewster	Green	Neumann
Browder	Gunderson	Ney
Brownback	Gutknecht	Norwood
Bryant (TN)	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Bunn	Hamilton	Oberstar
Bunning	Hancock	Obey
Burr	Hansen	Ortiz
Burton	Hastert	Orton
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Callahan	Hayes	Packard
Camp	Hayworth	Parker
Campbell	Hefley	Paxon
Canady	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Chabot	Heineman	Peterson (FL)
Chambliss	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Chapman	Hilleary	Petri
Chenoweth	Hilliard	Pickett
Christensen	Hinchey	Pombo
Chrysler	Hobson	Portman
Clement	Hoekstra	Poshard
Clinger	Hoke	Quillen
Coble	Holden	Rahall
Coburn	Hostettler	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Richardson
Combest	Hutchinson	Riggs
Cooley	Hyde	Roberts
Costello	Inglis	Rogers
Cramer	Istook	Rohrabacher
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Jones	Roth
Cremeans	Kanjorski	Royce
Cubin	Kelly	Salmon
Danner	Kim	Sanford
de la Garza	Kingston	Scarborough
Deal	Klink	Schaefer
DeLay	Klug	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Seastrand
Dickey	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	LaHood	Shadegg
Doolittle	Largent	Shuster
Dornan	Latham	Sisisky
Duncan	Laughlin	Skeen
Dunn	Lazio	Skelton
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
Ehrlich	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Linder	Smith (TX)
English	Livingston	Smith (WA)

Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NAYS—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Studds
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Calvert
Clay
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Cox
Cunningham
Dreier
Gibbons
Johnston
Lewis (CA)
McKeon
Moakley
Moorhead
Myers
Radanovich
Rose
Schroeder
Shaw
Stark
Stokes
Waters

□ 1206

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Radanovich for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Calvert for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

Messrs. SAXTON, LEVIN, and LEACH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GILLMOR changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 388, I call up the bill (H.R. 125), to repeal the ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to House Resolution 388, the amendment printed in House Report 104–490 is adopted.

The text of H.R. 125, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) One of the primary duties of government is to protect its citizens from armed violent criminals. America's cherished liberty and the social and economic prosperity of its communities are dependent upon government's ability to maintain public safety.

(2) Criminals, by definition, operate outside the law and routinely acquire firearms when they so desire. Banning specific types of firearms has no effect on the moral behavior of those who choose to inflict harm on innocent citizens.

(3) the most effective way to protect the public from gun-wielding violent criminals is to arrest, convict, and incarcerate such predators, and to ensure that they serve sentences of sufficient length to prevent them from returning quickly to the streets.

SEC. 3 ARMED VIOLENT CRIMINAL APPREHENSION DIRECTIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States shall establish an armed violent criminal apprehension program consistent with the following requirements:

(1) Each United States attorney shall designate at least 1, assistant United States attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals.

(2) Each United States attorney shall establish an armed violent criminal apprehension task force comprised of appropriate law enforcement representatives. The task force shall develop strategies for removing armed violent criminals from the streets, taking into consideration—

(A) the importance of severe punishment in deterring armed violent crime;

(B) the effectiveness of Federal and State laws pertaining to apprehension and prosecution of armed violent criminals;

(C) the resources available to each law enforcement agency participating in the task force;

(D) the nature and extent of the violent crime occurring in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed; and

(E) the principle of limited Federal involvement in the prosecution of crimes traditionally prosecuted in State and local jurisdictions.

(3) Not less frequently than monthly, the Attorney General shall require each United States attorney to report to the Department of Justice the number of defendants charged with, or convicted of, violating section 922(g) or 924 of title 18, United States Code, in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed.

(4) Not less frequently than twice annually, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a compilation of the information received by the Department of Justice pursuant to paragraph (3) and a report on all waivers granted under subsection (b).

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) REQUEST FOR WAIVER.—A United States attorney may request the Attorney General to waiver the requirements of subsection (a) with respect to the United States attorney.

(2) PROVISION OF WAIVER.—The Attorney General may waive the requirements of subsection (a) pursuant to a request made under paragraph (1), in accordance with guidelines which shall be established by the Attorney General. In establishing the guidelines, the Attorney General shall take into consideration the number of assistant United States attorneys in the office of the United States attorney making the request and the level of violent crime committed in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed.

(c) ARMED VIOLENT CRIMINAL DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term ''armed violent criminal'' means a person who is accused of violating section 922(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, having been previously convicted of a violent crime, or who is accused of violating section 924 of such title.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after the 5-year period that begins 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF THE PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (v) and (w) and by striking the appendix.

(b) Section 921(a) of such title is amended by striking paragraph (30).

(c) Section 921(a)(31)(A) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''manufactured after the date of enactment of the Violent Crime ''Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994''; and

(2) by striking''; or that can be readily restored or converted to accept,''.

(d) Section 923(i) of such title is amended by striking the last 2 sentences.

(e) Section 924(a)(1)(B) of such title is amended by striking ''(r), (v), or (w)'' and inserting ''or (r)''.

(f) Section 110104 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (18 U.S.C 921 note) is repealed.

SEC. 5. MANDATORY PRISON TERMS FOR POSSESSING, BRANDISHING, OR DISCHARGING A FIREARM OR DESTRUCTIVE DEVICE DURING A FEDERAL CRIME THAT IS A CRIME OF VIOLENCE OR A DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIME.

Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) A person who, during and in relation to any crime of violence or drug trafficking crime (including a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime which provides for an enhanced punishment if committed by the use of a deadly or dangerous weapon or device) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States—

''(A) possesses a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 5 years;

''(B) brandishes a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of

violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 10 years; or

''(C) discharges a firearm with the intent to injure another person, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 20 years;

except that if the firearm is a short-barreled rifle or short-barreled shotgun, or is equipped with a large capacity ammunition feeding device, such additional sentence shall be imprisonment for 10 years more than the term of imprisonment that would otherwise be imposed under this paragraph, and if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, such additional sentence shall be imprisonment for 30 years.

''(2) In the case of the second or subsequent conviction of a person under this subsection—

''(A) if the person possessed a firearm during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 20 years;

''(B) if the person brandished a firearm during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 25 years; or

''(C) if the person discharged a firearm with the intent to injure another person during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 30 years;

except that if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to life imprisonment.

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not impose a probationary sentence on any person convicted of a violation of this subsection, nor shall a term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection run concurrently with any other term of imprisonment including that imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime in which the firearm was used.

''(B) No person sentenced under this subsection shall be released for any reason whatsoever during a term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection.''.

Under the rule, gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of the time allocated to me to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], an original sponsor of this legislation to whom this entire body owes a round of thanks, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control his time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a leader on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and I ask that he be given permission to yield time in blocks.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, rarely would I use the Washington Post to illustrate a point, but today I must. As we begin debate today, Mr. Speaker, on this important self-defense anticriminal legislation, I must draw the attention of this body to the Washington Post, and a very unusual juxtaposition of articles therein, which really frame this debate.

The debate is a debate between Washington values and American values, Washington values as illustrated by the Washington Post's spin on this issue, quoting the title of this article here, ''Assault Gun Ban's Ricochet,'' and it goes on with the usual Washington spin, the usual Washington pap, the inside-the-Beltway stuff, that talks about some hidden agenda here, these extremists, this NRA, and it goes on and on with its Washington values, its Washington spin.

Immediately below and to the left, Mr. Speaker, is an article that really tells us what this debate is about.

□ 1315

It is about American values and a fear of the American people against criminals. It is about the American value that is enshrined in our Constitution that people like Suzonna Moore have the right to defend themselves because of rampant crime in our streets, not just our Nation's Capital, but especially in our Nation's Capital, and all across America.

According to the article, Mr. Speaker, this woman, an average American citizen, has felt the need to go out and buy a gun because she is not, her family is not, her house is not, her business is not being protected by the government, by the laws that we currently have on the books. We are here today to protect her and to protect millions of other American families against thugs and other criminals who would use firearms to blow away our friends, our husbands, our wives, our mothers, our parents, and our children.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many murders in America, far too many. What can we do in this body to alleviate that? Mr. Speaker, what can we do in this body to alleviate the pain that families, friends of men and women and children murdered by monsters on our streets and in our homes and in our businesses? Their pain, which we heard graphically about yesterday and read graphically about in the paper today, cannot and will not be alleviated by passing laws that say that our mothers and fathers, our husbands and wives, cannot defend themselves against heavily armed thugs.

Their pain cannot, will not, Mr. Speaker, be alleviated by laws that tell would-be murderers that ''If you, the murderers of America attack our families and if you do so with guns that have larger capacity magazines, you will be guaranteed to outgun your victims.'' Rather, Mr. Speaker, the paid of these good, honest, hard-working American citizens who have lost loved ones to thugs, using guns of whatever sort, can be alleviated and can only be alleviated by the knowledge that their neighbors and themselves will, if this bill today is enacted, be able to fully defend themselves, and by the assurance that no longer would police officers such as Robert Perkins of Chicago, IL, be gunned down by a thug who has previously been convicted of shooting an Army officer in the face with a shotgun, and who was on parole at the time that he then murdered the police officer.

Mr. Speaker, these bereaved families would like to have this assurance and are entitled to the assurance, because this legislation would make it impossible for someone who shot a U.S. Army officer in the face to be paroled. He would be in jail for at least 30 years without parole. If he used a firearm with a large capacity magazine, Mr. Speaker, he would serve, under this legislation which President Clinton, if he is indeed interested in being tough on criminals, would sign; if a high capacity magazine was used in that crime, that person, in addition to the 30-year minimum mandatory sentence, would receive an additional 10-year minimum mandatory sentence.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we attack the problem illustrated in the paper today. That is how we go to those families who have been up here on the Hill with heart-rending legitimate stories of murder in their communities and in their homes, that is how we can give them some small measure of assurance that this will not continue to happen in America, by allowing our citizens and our families to fully protect themselves against thugs, and by the assurance that at least in our Federal system, at least in our Federal system, that what happens to other people, the same thing will happen to them, that they will be put away, and put away for a long, long time.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the dear gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], if he would reread the Washington Post, which he does not like much anyway, it has nothing to do with assault weapons, the measure that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the one man in the House of Representatives that has worked consistently across the year when he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary, and throughout his career on crime issues, the leader on the assault weapons ban.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership and generosity on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a word that describes this House today, it is ''shame.'' This is one of the most shameful days in the history of this House. Barely 18 months ago, we passed the assault weapons ban, a ban that saves lives every day. Who, who outside the sordid world of the Washington Beltway, could believe that we would repeal this law today? Yet, today, the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the Republican majority opened fire on the ban. Who could believe that this Congress wants to put the Uzi's and the AK–47's, the MAC–10's and the TEC–9's and all the other killing machines, back on our streets? NEWT GINGRICH has bent his knee and is kissing the ring of the NRA, even though most of his own Republican colleagues know that this rash step is the wrong thing to do.

No matter how big a debt the Republican majority owes the NRA, the overwhelming majority——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] is reminded that the rules of the House do not allow personal attack on the House floor. The gentleman should confine his remarks to the subject matter at hand.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe I am confining myself to the subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And the Republican majority will pay a price for ignoring the majority of American people in November. I wish every Member of this House could look into the face of the survivors of the assault weapons mayhem, as I have. I wish every Member would talk to the families that have lost sons and daughters and wives and husbands to the assault weapon madness, as I have. They would know that these guns do not just look bad, they are bad.

Ask the victims, the surviving wives and husbands and fathers and children and mothers, are they happy that the people who did these crimes are put in jail? They are. Maybe they would want a longer sentence. But what they would want most of all is that those criminals never had the guns to begin with so their loved ones would be alive today.

Assault weapons are disproportionately used in crime. They make up less than 1 percent of all the guns in the country, and yet they have accounted for 8 percent of the guns traced in crimes. The American gun owners throughout America are onto the NRA's lies that an automatic weapon ban would somehow take the guns away from law-abiding citizens. This law has been in effect for over a year, and the truth is not a single gun covered by it has been taken away from any law-abiding citizen.

Mr. Speaker, those who favor this repeal say that it is not the guns, it is the criminals we should go after. Fine. If they really believe that, then why do we not allow the visitors to walk into this Chamber and into the halls of this House with Uzi's and AK–47's and MAC–10's? Why do we not just junk our metal detectors? That, Mr. Speaker, is what we are asking every cop in America to do today if we repeal this ban.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, has become more and more extreme. First, the Republican majority put the special interests above the pocketbooks of ordinary Americans. Now the Republican majority is putting the special interests of the Washington gun lobby above the lives of ordinary Americans. By bowing to the NRA and the extreme right, this House is putting the lives of American men, women, and children at risk. This is shameful, Mr. Speaker, shameful. The American people are scratching their heads in wonderment. This House should bow its head in shame.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me make sure that all Members of the House understand that this legislation is composed of three relatively simple elements. First is a repeal of she so-called assault rifle ban contained in the 1994 crime bill. Second, it contains a requirement that our Attorney General orders each U.S. attorney in America to designate, specify, and assign at least one assistant U.S. attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals, I think something needs to be done.

Third, this bill that we consider today will add enhanced minimum mandatory penalties on criminals who use firearms in the commission of a Federal crime. As trite as it may sound to some, it is the criminals who wreak the havoc on the families and the victims in this country. It is an outrage, and I do not think a single Member of this House would disagree when we see once— or twice-convicted criminals, criminals who have perhaps served time for a violent crime, who are paroled, and once again are put in a position where they are allowed and where circumstances allow that they can once again prey on the law-abiding in America.

As a former district attorney of 8 years, as is my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a prosecuting attorney, I can tell the Members that there are some, unfortunately, even some very young Americans, who by the time, I would suggest, they have gotten to the point that they can take a gun and point it in the face of a fellow person, a fellow citizen, when they have reached that point in their criminal career, then rehabilitation is probably beyond their reach.

When they have done that and been convicted and sent to jail, and they are out again and they do it again, it is time to lock up the violent criminals, it is time to throw away the key. It is time to punish those who wreak the kind of havoc on our families that we see as a result of gun violence.

It may sound trite, but I often wonder if we were here today debating how we could stop drunk driving, if someone would suggest the way that we stop the carnage on the highway, we stop the harm and the damage to families that are wreaked on those families by those that get drunk and drive, if someone came in here and said, ''I have got the answer. Let's make driving Rolls Royces illegal. Let's ban Rolls Royces, to stop drunk driving and stop the crime they do,'' that makes about as much sense as what this Congress did in 1994.

It seems to me that we should understand, it is the driver of the vehicle who creates and causes the damage. It is the person bent on crime, bent on violence, bent on destruction, bent on thievery or robbery or whatever criminal mischief they have, that we in this Congress owe an obligation to our constituents and to this country to protect them by locking those people up. That is what this legislation will do.

That is why it is so important that today we pass this bill and tell our fellow constituents and our fellow Americans, ''If you do this crime with a gun, you are gone. You are away. You will not be out there on parole, in society, where you can continue to wreak your havoc with the families and lives of innocent citizens.''

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are about today is important legislation, not only protecting constitutional rights of all Americans, but doing so in a way that gives Americans the real protection they need from the violent criminals they may face in unknown circumstances. I urge a vote yes for this legislation.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Rules for recommending to the primary holders of time that all sides within each party be given time, and specifically, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], for honoring that request and yielding time to the minority within the majority that strongly opposes repeal of the automatic weapons ban.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Second Amendment Restoration Act.

This bill has precious little to do with our Constitution. It has everything to do with turning back the

clock and repealing the assault weapons ban—a ban that is strongly supported by police officers everywhere—a ban that has been embraced by the American people.

Now, let us be clear, I have always supported the rights to legitimately owned weapons for sportsmen, hunters, and other law-abiding citizens. But this military-style assault weapons ban is, in the opinion of virtually every law enforcement authority in the country, an essential component of a comprehensive anticrime and anticriminal strategy.

This bill is necessary to give law enforcement the tools to attack the interstate gun running that goes on in these United States.

Let us be clear. This vote is a matter of conscience. The ban of military-style assault weapons was a rejection of ''politics as usual'' and an endorsement of ''law and order.''

My colleagues, the ban must stand.

We owe it to the law enforcement officers across this Nation—the men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day. They should not have to face Uzis and Streetsweepers and high-capacity clips as they work to protect our families.

And we owe it to the victims of gun violence, such as Amy Locicero Federici, of Hawthorne, NJ, who died in a hail of gunfire along the Long Island commuter railroad.

I would urge my colleagues to stand with law enforcement—to stand with the victims of violence—to stand with America's children—to defeat the repeal of this common-sense assault weapons ban.

Vote for the people, not the special interests.

□ 1230

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker spoke of the police and police officers, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] did, of course, likewise.

Let us lay something before the American people. Some police officers, some police chiefs endorse the gun ban. Some do not.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] speaks repeatedly of police chiefs supporting the Clinton-Schumer gun ban. And, as I said, some do. But that is not nearly the end of the story.

Other chiefs and thousands of line officers across this country, not only feel otherwise but know otherwise, such as the Police Benevolent Association. They know that the 1994 gun ban and any gun ban shifts the balance of power away from victims and toward the criminals.

These officers know that a responsible citizenry with the capability to defend itself against well-armed criminals and thugs who will always, I repeat, always have the ability to obtain whatever weapons they want, whenever they want, is a safer citizenry. There are very real examples which we will discuss.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my friend the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. BARR] was yesterday, but the Fraternal Order of Police were here again to beg us not to repeal this ban. The International Association of Police Chiefs are unanimous in opposing this repeal of the weapons ban. The Sheriffs Association. The National Association of Police Officers. Every organization of police in the United States of America supports the assault weapons ban. Every one. All. 100 percent. No exceptions. And so the gentleman unfortunately is in error.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, what was banned back in 1994? The weapons are not assault weapons.

Assault weapons are weapons that are used in time of war by our military. They are automatic weapons.

To educate those Members that do not know much about guns, all you have to do to fire 10, 15, 25 rounds with an automatic weapon, which is truly an assault weapon, which is only what our military have. They do not have any of these guns. Even Third World countries do not have these kind of guns.

All you have to do is you pull the trigger, and you keep pulling it and the gun keeps firing. That is an automatic weapon. That is an assault weapon.

These are not automatic weapons. Not a one of them we are talking about today.

They are semiautomatic rifles. They are the same thing as has been said before as the gentleman from New Mexico pointed out, the gentleman from Florida has pointed out. They are no different than what I use when I go hunting. The only difference is it is cosmetic. It is what they look like. And because they look like military-type weapons, they get banned. But they do not kill, they do not hurt, they do not maim any different than the same one that I use when I go deer hunting.

What is the purpose of banning these? It is to lead the people out there, the general public, to believe that this House, the Senate, and the President really did something about stopping crime, to make you feel good. It is a feel-better thing. Because it did not do that and it will not do that. Crime is going to continue, because crime is caused by the person who uses that gun, no matter what it is, or uses the knife or uses the ball bat or whatever they use to kill somebody or maim somebody.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address right now my words to the members of the media, especially Dan Rather who I heard last night say that these are rapid-fire assault weapons. The trouble with Peter Jennings, Dan Rather, Tom Brokaw, and people like that who come from the big cities, they do not know anything about guns.

These are not rapid-fire guns, gentlemen. When you talk about this bill this evening on the network news, please call it what it is. It is a semiautomatic. To fire it, you have to pull the trigger each time. That is what you have to do.

It is no different than the hunting rifles that people use all the time in this country to hunt with. No different. And why they are called assault weapons, well, that is just a misnomer that the proponents of gun control have come up with to lead the people to believe that we are really doing something about crime.

Vote to repeal this ban. Let us get really on to putting criminals behind bars and stopping crime.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to just say that strong crime control laws and assault weapon bans are not mutually exclusive. We need both.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield 1 minute and 40 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the NRA's position on the second amendment, that individuals have an absolute right to bear arms and any attempt to restrict that right is a direct violation of the Constitution. I understand that argument. I do not buy it.

Under the first amendment, a person cannot yell ''fire'' in a crowded theater. I do not understand people who think the second amendment should enable someone to fire into a crowded theater. If we can put responsible restrictions on free speech, our most fundamental right, why can we not do the same, put responsible restrictions on the right to bear arms?

It is the slippery slope, they will tell us: Once we ban one weapon, the next thing we know, the Government will be knocking on our door to take away all our guns.

Keep in mind, the slope goes both ways. As technology continues to advance, weapons are increasingly becoming capable of killing more and more people in one fell swoop.

Is there no weapon that supporters of this bill think should be prohibited in the public interest? Should we allow people to drive tanks down the street, or have biological or nuclear weapons in their possession? Of course not. That is unreasonable. And so is this proposal.

Why is it that most police organizations support the ban on these weapons? It is because our good neighbors who put their lives on the line to protect the public are increasingly being outgunned, and this is not just a feeling they have, an impression, it is a fact.

The rest of the world looks on in wonderment and fear a we go out of our way to facilitate this carnage.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure which does nothing to help law-abiding citizens but a great deal to help gang members and other criminals. I see no reason to bring back weapons no civilian needs but criminals prefer. It seems to me we are catering to the wrong crowd.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for using my language of H.R. 698 as the basis of this good bill.

This legislation reaffirms our commitment to defend the Constitution and it also includes enhanced penalties for criminal use of a gun in Federal crimes. This legislation does what the original gun ban legislation could never have done: It fights crime.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], a member of the committee who has worked on this subject matter for a considerable period of time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we have had no hearings, very little time to debate, so let me give my colleagues a picture that is worth a thousand words.

This is Police Officer Richard Morrisey who was shot by a crazed gunman in East Chester, NY, yesterday. His partner Officer Michael Frey was killed before he could get out of his car. In all, more than 100 rounds were fired from inside the house. The crazed gunman killed a police officer, his own grandmother, his dog, and himself.

He did not have an assault weapon, but imagine the firepower and the additional carnage if he had.

Cops tell us that military style assault weapons present the greatest danger to officers and civilians alike.

These weapons turn murderous nuts like the one in East Chester yesterday or the Long Island Railroad into killing machines, able to fire multiple rounds quickly without reloading.

What is the message we are sending to the family of Officer Frey and to our constituents who want to live free from fear?

Is the NRA really more important than the lives of cops and law-abiding citizens?

My colleagues, just say no to this abomination.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, a little earlier a gentleman on the other side of the aisle made mention of an automobile not being banned because people are killed, but the automobiles do have standards set upon them to help prevent that: Brakes, seat belts, frame structure, a whole range of other things.

Also an earlier speaker on this side of the aisle talks about American values when talking about this issue, and I would say massive accumulation of high-tech weapons is not about American values.

At the time the Constitution was ratified, the only two choices of weapons you had was a smooth bore musket or a musket with rifling, not Uzi's, TEC–9's and a whole range of other things which, even though they are semiautomatic, you can get off about 100 to 120 rounds a minute and maybe even more.

The Constitution protects people's rights right now to hunt, target shoot, defend themselves, or collect.

The bill we passed a couple of years ago defends that right and statutorily protects 650 weapons that you can choose from. The American values and the Constitution allows for diversity of opinion, and it is my opinion that we should not repeal the assault weapons manufacturing ban.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point here today can be best illustrated by this chart I have put up here.

This is a good gun. This is a bad gun. This gun is banned. This gun right down here is exactly the same weapon as that one up there, precisely the same weapon. The same company makes it, it has the same firepower, the same killing power, and yet we have banned one and we have not banned the other simply because of looks.

What we have got in the assault weapons ban is a sham. What we should be doing is what this bill does, and this bill does what needs to be done, it puts deterrence into the law and it says, ''Hey. If you use a weapon, a gun, in any Federal crime, you're going to get 5 years for simply possessing it, 10 years for brandishing it and 15 years in jail for firing that gun and double that if you commit a second crime. And if you use a clip with 10 or more cartridges, you get not only that, you get the first crime, the first offense for possession 10 years, the second 20, and the third 30.''

□ 1245

So that is what we should be doing. This particular assault weapon ban is ridiculous. We should not have passed it in the first place. Repealing it today is common sense. I urge a vote to repeal it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], is a Tec-9 a good gun or a bad gun?

Well, let us talk about, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], automatic and semiautomatic weapons. They tested, among, in the San Jose police department, they test-fired an Uzi, a 30–round magazine was emptied in slightly less than 2 seconds on full automatic, while the same magazine was emptied in just 5 seconds on semiautomatic. In other words, on semiautomatic assault weapons, you can fire 300 rounds a minute. The only reason it could not be done is the magazine will not hold that many. It can be done because here is a police test. It can be done. Oh, you do not like 300? How about 150 a minute?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has ever had a gun in his hand.

Mr. CONYERS. If the gentleman will yield, you do not need to know that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is physically impossible. It cannot be done.

I rise this afternoon to support H.R. 125. It is about time we set the record straight on the gun ban debate. The misinformation campaign waged by antigun groups and echoed in the media has intentionally distorted the issue.

What is an assault weapon? Just as in the general public, I am sure there are Members in this House who cannot distinguish between a fully automatic weapon and a semiautomatic weapon. The firearms banned by last session's legislation are ugly, but I have run across some very nice people in the world who are not so pretty. What a firearm looks like has nothing to do with how a firearm functions. When the media talks about the need to ban semiautomatic firearms, they hold up and point to fully automatic weapons like the much-publicized Uzi and AK–47s and other automatic weapons, which have been illegal for more than 40 years.

As the bill's language states, banning specific types of firearms has no effect on the behavior of those who commit violent crimes with firearms. The only sure way to keep gun-wielding violent criminals off the streets is to put them away in prison for a long, long time.

This legislation provides a real solution. It gets tough on criminals who use a firearm in violent criminal acts. Under this bill, convicted armed criminals will be sentenced to a minimum of 5 years in prison and not less than 20 years for a second offense.

A person who discharges a firearm while committing a violent crime must be sentenced to a minimum of 20 years in prison and not less than 30 years for a second offense.

If we can put criminals away and keep them away, we will reduce crime. Law-abiding gunowners want these criminals off the streets. They do not care whether they are using a gun, a knife, or a baseball bat. We must have swift, sure justice. We cannot continue to ask law-abiding Americans to forgo their constitutional right to own a firearm.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect rights of law-abiding gunowners. Let us be tough on criminals, for a change, by voting for H.R. 125.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Here is the American values and the Constitution, which allows for diversity of opinion. The difference between these two weapons, this has a collapsible stock. It can be hidden in a small big, easier to walk into McDonald's or a bank; it provides also a pistol grip which makes it a lot easier to hold the weapon down while shooting it fast, and an extended magazine gives you a much larger capacity for bullets, which means if you walk into McDonald's or some other place, if you have some crazy nut, he is going to be able to kill more people with this gun than with this gun.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Almost 2 years ago this House debated and passed the semiautomatic assault weapon ban. It made eminent sense to pass that legislation then to keep these weapons of war from falling into the hands of criminals. It makes even more sense to keep the ban now. The ban is working. It is fighting crime. It is helping our police officers, and it is protecting our law-abiding citizens.

Since its enactment, the number of assault weapons used in crime has dropped 18 percent, and that will increase as fewer and fewer are available. Assault weapons are harder for criminals to get. The price of these has tripled in that same period of time, and after many decades of rising crime in America, we have finally started to reduce our crime rate.

The assault weapon ban is strongly supported by law enforcement officials. It makes their job safer. Every major law enforcement organization supports the ban. The ban is supported by 80 percent of the American people, who strongly feel criminals should not have assault weapons.

This also is a public safety issue. It is an anticrime issue. We must vote to continue the ban.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The gentleman from Delaware is very learned, but he must know there are major police organizations that do not support the gun ban, that do not support gun control, such as the Police Benevolent Association, representing thousands of police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN], a distinguished member of the firearms legislation task force committee.

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

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for two purposes: first, to inform my colleagues that H.R. 125 has been substantially changed through language that I was privileged to include in the bill yesterday; second, to explain why this language improves this legislation.

The 1994 weapons ban was simply misguided legislation and cosmetic. The 1994 bill penalizes those who lawfully own firearms and at the same time ignores those individuals who commit crimes with firearms.

My language corrects the 1994 bill by imposing severe sentences on individuals who carry, display, or use firearms during the commission of a crime. The language also incorporates a balance between public safety and the right to bear arms by law-abiding citizens.

With the language included in H.R. 125, this bill will rain thunder, not cosmetics, on those individuals who carry, display, or use firearms during the committing of a crime.

I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 125.

With the Heineman language included, H.R. 125 is now effective crime legislation, and I join my colleagues in stating that the Southern States PBA, comprised of 16,000 police officers, does not support the ban.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], one of our very thoughtful members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, I wonder on today, March 22, 1996, why this legislation is on the floor of the House. We have just heard a confusing announcement of who is for it and who is against it.

Let me tell you why it is here: Because the victims are dead. That is why it is here. There are no victims to lobby and be able to say that we are not here because of these kinds of violent weapons. This was the bill yesterday, H.R. 125, 1 page, 1 page to ban the repeal of assault weapons.

We know what happened: Politics got into this, and so they caused the confusion that this is an anticrime piece of legislation.

Now it is some 10 pages long. It is a joke. All they are doing is saying, ''We want to repeal the assault weapons ban, and we will cloud the issue with a ruling about violent crime. We can penalize criminals.''

We are all against it. What are we going to do about dead police officers, what are we going to do about Steve Posado's wife, who was gunned down in a San Francisco law firm with an automatic weapon?

Vote this legislation down. It is a masquerade.

It is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 125, the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act. The House leadership has brought this bill to floor without hearings or a markup in the Crime Subcommittee or the full Judiciary Committee. This process is an outrage. In fact, this bill is only being considered because of promises made to very influential special interest groups.

First of all, we must clear up the confusion over the ban on semiautomatic weapons in the 1994 crime law. Contrary to popular belief, provisions in the 1994 crime law only banned 19 semiautomatic weapons. Moreover, persons who already owned such weapons prior to the new law could still lawfully possess such weapons. Additionally, it is important to point out that approximately 650 rifles and shotguns were exempted from the new law. The ban on those 19 semiautomatic weapons has been a great success. Such weapons were used primarily by individuals who engage in criminal activity. The question that I raise is what law-abiding citizen has need for an Uzi or a gun commonly known as a ''Street Sweeper''? This ban has had no effect on Americans who are hunters and sportsmen.

The ban on those 19 semiautomatic weapons is fully supported by all major law enforcement organizations, such as the National Sheriffs' Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The membership of these organizations are on the front line in the war on crime and they know first-hand the importance of keeping these assault weapons off of the streets of America.

This bill is a bad bill because it also repeals the provisions of the 1994 crime law that makes the use of a semiautomatic weapon during a Federal crime or violence or drug trafficking punishable by 5 years in prison. Furthermore, it repeals the provision in current law that makes it a Federal offense to manufacture or sell these assault weapons.

Finally, let me add that the majority of the American people support this ban because it has made a difference in making their communities safe. In fact, statistics indicate that assault weapons make up 1 percent of all guns but are 18 times more likely than other guns to be used to kill police officers or to be traced to other criminal activity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 125. It is a terrible bill. It is unnecessary and will contribute to greater criminal activity across the Nation.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am for this repeal. I have for 18 years been against gun control because I think it is feel-good that does not work. So after 18 years, I have 100 percent voting record with the NRA.

Now let me say something about the NRA: The NRA, in my opinion, in the last few years, because of its hierarchy,

has become an apparatus to elect right-wing politicians to State legislatures and to this Congress.

And the members of the NRA ought to understand the partisanship of that group, and if you do not believe it, think of this: President Reagan and President Bush both opposed major legislation that the NRA was for, and they were for major legislation that the NRA was against, and nobody in America knows it because of the partisanship of the NRA.

I vote on this issue on the policy of it. But I must say that the NRA has indeed become an apparatus to elect right-wingers.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very painful vote, because there are great arguments on both sides and there are great people on both sides. I do not see the point of polarizing this. This is across the lines of politics and party and geography.

But I, after much wrestling with this idea, this issue, come out opposed to H.R. 125. At the same time, I strongly support the second amendment. I believe every American has the right to keep and bear arms. But as the first amendment guaranteeing free speech has reasonable restrictions, copyright, trademarks, slander, libel, obscenity, fire in a crowded theater, it does not impair the rigor of the first amendment to have reasonable restrictions on it, so the second amendment can endure and flourish with reasonable restrictions.

I do not think the kid next door should have a flamethrower or a Howitzer or a 5-inch .38. And so where you draw the line? It seems to me hunters have a right to hunting rifles, hunting guns. A person has a right to a pump shotgun to protect his home, and I am told that is the weapon that will do it. Target shooters have a right to weapons.

But an Uzi, an AK–47, has no legitimate purpose in the civilian population. It may have a purpose during war because all they can do is kill a lot of people in a hurry. But it seems to me the promiscuous proliferation, forgive the alliteration, of these weapons among youth gangs in cities, who many times can outgun the police, is stupid.

It is not an impairment of the second amendment to say ''no.'' Take your hunting rifle, take your shotgun, take your target pistol and your target rifle, but an AK–47, a Street Sweeper, belongs in the arsenal under lock and key.

Now, this bill is a statement. I know that. It does not do much. The definition of an assault weapon is kind of vague and fuzzy. But it is a statement that there are too many guns out there.

They are killing instrumentalities. They are too available to people unfit and unsuited physically and temperamentally and emotionally to use them, and there ought to be a limit. And if this cuts down the millions of guns that are available to people who are unsuited to use them, then it is worthwhile. It only lasts 10 years. We have used up 2. It sunsets, then it does not make them illegitimate, it just says no more importation and no more manufacture.

□ 1300

Let us give it a chance, and maybe some lives. But I do not think this violates the second amendment. I think it is a reasonable restriction.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about firepower. True rapid fire automatic weapons, military assault weapons, have been banned for years, and they should be banned. What can make a weapon an assault weapon, and thereby illegal under the current legislation, is whether is carries a bayonet. The same rifle with a bayonet can be illegal as an assault weapon under this legislation. The same rifle without a bayonet can be a legal weapon. I invite any proponent of the current legislation to explain exactly how whether a weapon can carry a bayonet makes sense.

Second of all, Director Magaw of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, has told me that the Federal Government does not keep records of when what they call assault weapons are used in crimes. If the chief Government enforcer of Federal firearms law says the Government does not keep records of when such weapons are used in crime, I think that makes any statistics being thrown out here about the use of these weapons in crime and how they have been affected, if at all, by the current legislation, very, very suspect.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds for the attention of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Now, STEVE, you know that there is a floating list of requirements, and that bayonet mount that you keep laying up here is 1 of 7 or 10 items. So, please stop taking advantage of the House. As a matter of fact, it is folding-telescoping stock, protruding pistol grip, bayonet mount that drives you furious, threaded muzzle or flash suppressor, or grenade launcher. All of those are stated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 20 seconds.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone in Michigan committed a crime recently with a grenade launcher?

Mr. CONYERS. I do not know, and you do not either. That is not the point.

Mr. SCHIFF. The gentleman gave me the time. Any two of those items, including a grenade launcher, can make a weapon illegal under the current legislation. None of that has anything to do with firepower. If any or all of the matters the gentleman listed had anything to do with firepower, do a demonstration. Put the two weapons next to each other and prove your point.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we passed an historic crime bill that included a ban on assault weapons, and it was supported by 80 percent of the public. It is hard to believe that we are here today. So why are we here? Because the NRA donated a lot of money to Republican campaigns, and the NRA expects a return on its investment, and now it wants its money's worth. This is absolutely wrong. It is a wrong time for us to turn our back on our Nation.

Just yesterday in my district in Eastchester, NY, a lunatic killed a police officer in the line of duty with a high-powered rifle. The police do not need less protection from maniacs with guns; they need more.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Connecticut, who is also one of our bipartisan leaders on the issue of campaign finance reform. I mention that because I think this bill goes more to the need for campaign finance reform than it says about assault weapons. You know, the fact is that this bill is not going any place, it is going to be vetoed. There are far more important things we need to be doing.

But the three-quarters of the American people support the ban, because they know it is reasonable and is working, can only conclude this bill is coming up because the NRA convention is coming up, and our Members wanted to have some of that $2 million they are going to be parceling out.

So in the interest of restoring the individual reputation of the Members and the institutional credibility of this body, is it not time that Members, both Democrats and Republicans alike, when they precede their remarks in favor of this bill or who plan to vote for this bill, publicly disclose how much they in fact have taken from the NRA and whether they intend to continue taking money from the NRA? That is the kind of complete disclosure and real campaign finance reform. It is time to do the public's interest instead of PAC's.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman questioning the motives of his colleagues?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has not been recognized. The gentleman from California is out of order.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to state that through this whole debate, gun control is not crime control. Here in Washington, where the possession of handguns are illegal, you can walk right out that Capitol Hill door and you see windows that have bars on them in homes and businesses, and, to me, it is highly reflective that the wrong people are behind bars.

People are living in fear in this town. What this is about is giving citizens the opportunity to defend themselves from the real thugs. It is the thugs, it is the criminals, who pull the trigger. We should have greater deterrence to go after them. That is what this bill does.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] to know that, yes, motives were being raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is extreme. Three out of four Americans support the assault weapons ban. Two out of three gun owners support the assault weapons ban.

This bill contradicts what the Republican majority claims they stand for. You cannot be anticrime and pro-Uzi. You cannot be pro-family and pro-AK–47.

This debate is not a question of hunting and self-defense. Assault weapons are not used for hunting purposes. Only drug dealers use Uzis for self-defense. The only real question is, is there anything the Republican majority will not do for the NRA?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, my commitment is to protect this Nation's law abiding citizens, or, more importantly, to allow them to protect themselves.

I am deeply concerned about the terrible toll that violent crime takes on our society. Decent people are being held hostage by a small but brutally violent segment of our population. Our response? Criminals serve increasingly smaller portions of already short sentences, while we take rights away from their victims.

The FBI statistics prove that banning guns does not address the growing crime rate. Less than 3 percent of murders in this country involve semiautomatic weapons. A person has a 95-percent greater chance of being killed by a blunt object than a rifle. Maybe we should ban knives and fists, which are responsible for 15 and 5 percent of homicides respectively.

The right to keep and bear arms is a basic guarantee of our Constitution, and, no, this right has not outlived its purpose in today's world. We must renew and strengthen this right for our law abiding citizens. The way to fight crime, Mr. Speaker, is to punish criminals for the crimes they commit by imposing harsh penalties and assuring that they are served. If you want to join me in encouraging States to do this, cosponsor my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 105.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember who we are talking about in this debate. Taking guns from Americans does not make them safer because the criminals will still have them. We cannot solve our crime problem by limiting an honest citizen's right to own a firearm. Our commitment, Mr. Speaker, should be to allow our people to protect themselves.

Please support House Resolution 125 and please cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 105.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, oh, nonsense. Strong law enforcement and stiff penalties and reasonable gun control measures are not alternatives. We can and we should do both of them.

The NRA began losing the American people when it failed to follow most law enforcement officers who support Brady and a ban on certain assault weapons. Many NRA members are not absolutists. They realize that the Supreme Court never interpreted the constitution to say that people may own and use any weapon they want in our country. They realize that with rights in our free society go responsibilities, responsibilities to the rest of society.

No one wants to take guns from law abiding citizens who use them for sport or hunting purposes or for protection. But it is time the NRA should respect and be responsible to the 75 to 80 percent of the American people who say that reasonable gun control laws are not too much to ask.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], whose hard time for hard criminals is included in this bill.

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand up for the fact that this has tough mandatory sentencing for those criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the measure before us today. This legislation makes it clear that problem with guns in our society is not the guns but the felons who use them.

While the most contentious debate today will be over the unnecessary ban on certain semiautomatic firearms, I have worked hard to make sure that this legislation would include another important provision.

Section 5 of this bill will dramatically increase the penalties for possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm during the commission of a Federal felony.

This section, which is similar to the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act which I introduced last week, provides stiff mandatory sentences for anyone who commits a crime with a gun, with even stiffer sentences for those who discharge a firearm while committing a crime.

This bill sends a clear message that we need to keep society's most violent felons behind bars. Americans have zero tolerance for violent crime, so our justice system should too. Our families and children should not be afraid to walk to school, go to the grocery store, and leave their windows open at night.

I believe firmly that gun control is not crime control. Why would someone willing to commit murder respect gun control laws?

Gun control, while often well-intentioned, has simply failed. We have over 22,000 gun control laws on the books today. Controlling those who use guns in a criminal way is far more effective than cracking down on the vast majority of law-abiding citizens who own firearms for hunting and their own protection.

We should work to keep those who would misuse guns in jail. No more slick criminal defense attorneys pushing criminals to freedom through legal loopholes. No more soft sentences after teary speeches before the bench. No more legal gymnastics setting criminals free after a fraction of their allotted time in jail.

I have worked hard to get language included in this bill which would keep violent criminals behind bars, and section 5 of this bill is going to do just that. I applaud and thank the leadership for including increased penalties for crimes committed with guns in this important legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding me time. Let me ask my colleagues, how many gun control laws are on the books? Twenty thousand? Twenty thousand are on the books. And where are most of those laws applying? Washington, DC.

You know, it is appropriate when my colleague from Georgia talked about the Washington Post. There was an article today that got my attention that showed crime has increased in Washington, DC, since 1995, 14 percent.

A Lieutenant Duckett there, president of the Black Police Caucus, said gun control has not worked in Washington, DC. The only people who have guns are the criminals.

Washington, DC, is often referred to as ''the crime capital of the country.'' Guess what folks? DC has one of the strictest gun control laws in the entire country.

In fact, Lt. Lowell K. Duckett, president of the Black Police Caucus said citizens are right to arm themselves. He also said ''Gun control

has not worked in DC. The only people who have guns are the criminals.''

Lieutenant Duckett further stated, ''DC has one of the strictest gun laws in the Nation,'' it also has one of the highest murder rates.

And so, criminals are armed while good, law-abiding citizens are not. In the wild west at least both sides were armed.

Now, criminals are armed and dangerous—citizens are the one's living in a prison-like atmosphere.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] my dear friend and Democratic colleague, and I are going to continue our discussion at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Covell Hall in Detroit tomorrow. So stay tuned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] who has worked very hard on this matter.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment does not allow Americans to own tanks or bazookas or grenade launchers or assault weapons. But the chief lobbyist of the NRA testified before Congress this year that anyone should be able to own them.

I cannot believe that we are actually debating on the floor of Congress whether the American people are safer with these guns on or off the streets. But we are debating it today. Why? Promises made and promises kept, ladies and gentlemen. Promises made and promises kept. The NRA has come to town to redeem a promise, and the Republican freshmen who made this deadly deal are about to keep it.

Do not insult our police officers, who are sick and tired of having their fellow officers gunned down by crackpots. Do not insult the mothers and fathers of elementary school children sprayed with 106 rounds in Stockton, CA. Do not insult the American people, who saw their own White House peppered with gunfire by a lunatic with an assault weapon.

Stop this Congress before it hurts somebody. Vote no.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

□ 1315

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there is too much crime and too much violence in these crimes. That is why I support doing away with the gun ban because it is false advertising. It does not deal with these problems. This ban, the existing ban, deals with how a firearm looks. Does it have a bayonet mount or a flash suppressor? Then it is banned. But a gun, a firearm that shoots the same bullet at the same velocity with the same impact but looks different, that can be legal.

Mr. Speaker, the FBI and the Department of Justice statistics themselves show that one has a greater chance of being murdered tonight with a steak knife or by fish or feet than by one of these types of firearms. My experience is that criminals who want to commit a crime with a gun are going to get a gun, it does not matter what it is.

What we can do is what is in this bill, and that is make sure that they do the time. Let us make sure that there is a stiff mandatory sentence so that they are removed from society. Fighting crime requires more than simple feel-good-but-accomplish-little legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, what did former Presidents Reagan and Bush, former Senator Barry Goldwater, a majority of law enforcement officials and a majority of the American public and many members of the NRA have in common? They all supported the ban on assault weapons that we passed in the 103d Congress, and they continue to do so.

We are not talking about hunting weapons. We are talking about firearms whose only purpose is to kill large numbers of people as quickly as possible. Hundreds of firearms are still available to sportsmen and to those who want it for self-defense. Assault weapons are disproportionately used for criminal purposes. I want my colleagues to know that that ban in the 103d Congress has made a difference because we have found that, with the ban in place, 18.4 percent fewer assault weapons were traced to crime in the first 8 months of 1995 than in the first 8 months of 1994, the first such decline in recent years.

I urge my colleagues very earnestly to vote against this repeal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again announce the times. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 4 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has a minute and a quarter, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the previous debate, one of our colleagues said the scum of the Earth uses these weapons. I say to my colleagues, let us get rid of the scum. But let me say something, the scum will use anything to kill with.

Let me tell my colleagues about a couple of them in Georgia. We had one who shot a police officer with a shotgun, let him bleed to death. We got rid of that scum, we executed him. I witnessed it. Let me tell about another scum who took a club and beat a woman's head to a pulp. We got rid of that scum. We executed him. We got over 100 scums waiting on death row with the same punishment. Let us get rid of the scum, not law abiding citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we knew it was coming, and now the payoff to the NRA has finally arrived. It is common knowledge that the NRA pumped $1.4 million into supporting extremist candidates. As a result, Speaker GINGRICH now has the votes to advance the NRA agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is a shame for this House. This vote, Mr. Speaker, amounts to nothing more than a big payback. No wonder Congress' approval rating has sunk so low.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives written in May 1994:

> We are writing to urge your support for a ban on the domestic manufacture of military-style assault weapons. This is a matter of vital importance to the public safety.

I will not read the rest of the letter, but those are the two opening sentences of a letter signed by former Republican President Gerald Ford, former Democratic President Jimmy Carter, former Republican President Ronald Reagan. This is not radical stuff. The letter goes on to refer to the 1989 import ban that resulted in an impressive 40-percent drop in the imported assault weapons, passed, administratively by President Bush, Republican President Bush. That import ban is mirrored in this ban on assault weapons.

All this does is to prevent the domestic manufacture of the very same weapons a Republican President prevented the import of. Logical, simple, fair. That is why the American people support it.

The second amendment was not drawn with modern weapons in mind. And as the development of modern communications technology has required us to modernize the communications law, so the development of modern weaponry available on our markets has required us to modernize first our import policy and then our domestic law.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the ban means wasting the time and limited resources of our police and courts. The police will spend their time disarming potential victims instead of going after youth gangs who are terrorizing our inner cities. This mentality of the ban would send the authorities after religious eccentrics down in Waco.

Let us focus on the criminal. Let us not waste the time and resources of our police on disarming innocent people who just want to defend themselves but

have never committed a crime. That is the mentality that burned those people out in Waco, and that is what my colleagues are fostering today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues what this shameful debate is all about. Rather than risk offending the NRA, Speaker GINGRICH would rather risk the lives of policemen and innocent people.

Today I received a letter from a Chicago policeman who puts his life on the line every day fighting gangs in that city. He sent me clippings of policemen killed in Chicago by these assault weapons and begged me to vote against this ban. The choice before this House is between the police and the gun lobby. The choice is between the safety of the men and women who put the badges on and put their lives on the line every day and the political power of the gun lobby. Vote no on this shameful bill.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], a former Peace Corps volunteer.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the nonpartisanship of getting the time from the Republican side because I want to remind the House of the tragedy that took place in Louisville, KY, at the Standard Gravure plant. People were working when a disgruntled former employee came in with one of these weapons and killed eight people. He wounded horribly my wife's first cousin.

I introduced a ban on these weapons in 1989 in Kentucky. I would be embarrassed to be a part of this body when it is repealed. I stand with our police, with our police chiefs, and with the American people and urge defeat of this repeal.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire as to how much time is remaining on all sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 1 minute and 50 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 3 minutes and 10 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how low can you go? This 104th Congress has hit a new low. The NRA, I mean the GOP leadership, showed me the old saying is true, he who has the gold makes the rule. Law enforcement officers from my district have told me how critical it is to keep the assault ban in place. No one needs an AK–47 to defend their home or to go hunting unless they are hunting people. We must think about the message Congress is sending to young people of America by saying assault weapons are OK.

Sometimes you just don't appreciate how good something is until it is gone. Today, I truly miss Speaker Foley for his fairness in allowing debate on the important issues. We used to sing a song, ''How Low Can You Go?'' This 104th Congress has hit a new low. The NRA, I mean the GOP leadership, shows me that the old saying is true, ''He who has the gold, makes the rules.''

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the strongest opposition to repealing the ban on assault weapons. I voted in 1994 to put a ban on deadly assault weapons because they are responsible for the deaths of too many of my people. It is unconscionable for responsible legislators to repeal this important ban. Without hearings or committee action, and only 1 hour of floor debate, it seems the reason for today's vote is so the majority party can pay back the NRA. That's not good enough for me or the people in my district who want to keep this ban in place.

Law enforcement officials from all over my district have told me how critical it is to keep the assault ban in place. Police Chief Wayland Clifton, of Gainesville, FL, says:

> The incidence of violent crime, especially involving firearms, is on the rise in America. This fact is confirmed by numerous studies conducted by the Department of Justice. . . . Many times, instances of mass violence and multiple homicides are worse when assault weapons are used. The weapons, due to their nature, provide criminals with greater firepower, thus these weapons pose a greater risk to both police officers and potential victims.

Even though assault weapons make up less than 1 percent of all guns, they are 18 times more likely to be cop-killers. Police support this ban because outlawing assault weapons saves the lives of police and the general public.

There is already proof that the ban is working to lower rates of violent crime. The number of assault weapons traces initiated in the first 8 months of 1995 dropped from 1994 levels. According to tracing data collected by BATF, assault weapons, as a percentage of all gun traces, fell for the second year in a row, from 5 percent in 1994 to 4.3 percent in 1995. Despite these encouraging trends, assault weapons are still a major threat to Americans, and especially law enforcement officers.

Finally, I have talked with the families of too many victims of guns too easily obtained. No one needs an AK–47 to defend their home or to go hunting—unless you are hunting people. We must think about the message Congress sends to the young people of America. What kind of message do we send by saying assault weapons are OK? The ban on deadly assault weapons must stay in place.

GAINESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Gainesville, FL, March 21, 1996.

Hon. CORRINE BROWN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CORRINE BROWN: I understand that a vote on H.R. 125 regarding a proposal to lift the ban on assault weapons is scheduled for March 22, 1996. The ban on assault weapons is very important to law enforcement, so I am seeking your assistance on this matter.

As you well know, the incidence of violent crime, especially involving firearms, is on the rise in America. This fact is confirmed by numerous studies conducted by the Department of Justice. In addition to these statistics regarding the degree of victimization, the newspapers provide anecdotal evidence about the severity of violent crime in America. Many times, instances of mass violence and multiple homicides are exacerbated when assault weapons are used. These weapons, due to their nature, provide criminals with greater firepower, thus these weapons pose a greater risk to both police officers and potential victims.

Therefore, to alleviate the potential threat that assault weapons pose to our citizens, I urge that you vote against H.R. 125 and not lift the ban on assault weapons.

Sincerely,

WAYLAND CLIFTON, Jr.,
Chief of Police.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], our newest Member but also a former Member.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, you cannot deter somebody who, having shot weapons at innocent people, turns the weapon on himself and kills himself. No amount of enhanced penalties can deter that person, and that is exactly what happened in Kileen, TX; Louisville, KY; Stockton, CA; Jacksonville, CA; 101 California Street in San Francisco, and those are just since I first entered the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the size of the clip, the ability to shoot rapidly, these are characteristics which give the power to kill to people who are insane in these instances, and increasing penalties does nothing to deter them.

Last, to those of my colleagues who care so much about the Constitution, the second amendment begins that, ''A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.'' It begins with the words, ''A well-regulated militia.'' What the assault weapons ban does is well-regulate that militia. The militia constitute the armed citizenry. It is our duty to regulate them.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I find it interesting the gentleman from California who just spoke about the second amendment of the Constitution failed to emphasize the fact that it is not the militia's right to keep and bear arms. The Constitution clearly says that it is the people's right to keep and bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to make something very clear about the NRA. This is nothing but a smokescreen to divert the attention of the real debate here. I am here to tell Members, the NRA did not support me. They heavily supported my opponent, and yet the NRA is right on this issue and right on second amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a political issue. This is an issue of citizens' rights, because the real issue is not guns. The real issue here is crime. We banned the so-called assault weapons and we still have crime. As a result, some will argue that we need to ban many more guns, and that argument, Mr. Speaker, is offensive. It is offensive to common sense, and it is offensive to the Constitution. We need to punish criminals, not inanimate objects. Mr. Speaker, we need to reserve the fundamental rights of the American people.

When we address the issue of violent crime, we must remember the second item of our Bill of Rights, the rights of the people to keep, the rights of the people, not the militia, the people, to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed. Let us address the real problem of crime, Mr. Speaker, and let us undo the damage that has been done to the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, this vote boils down to one question: How much is a life worth? How large a campaign check from the gun lobby is big enough to convince you to put these guns back on the street, $1,000 from the NRA, $5,000? To put the life of a police officer in grave danger, to put a child in an early grave?

□ 1330

Because of these guns, they mean combat, they mean assault, they mean killing. This vote shows that the Republicans never wanted a Contract With America; they wanted to combat within America.

How many children were able to avoid a drive-by shooting? How many police officers made it safely back home because of this ban? Let us keep the ban and keep our children and our communities safe.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will take these last few seconds to talk mainly to my Democratic colleagues about the circumstances we find ourselves in today. As a strong, strong proponent and always having been a strong proponent of second amendment rights, I know that this debate has been permeated, not just today, with innuendo about who may be influencing whose elections, but has been permeated by politics throughout the entire history of this debate. I know there have been references to 1994, when the gun ban became law as a part of the 1994 crime bill, and I look at my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle, and I see a lot of new Members that are here, Republican friends and Republican colleagues, and I see a lot of missing Democrats, Democrats that were here in the 103d Congress that are no longer with us.

Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Congress, Jack Brooks, my good friend from the Ninth District of Texas, is not here today. He at that time was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary because Democrats were in a majority in the 103d Congress.

Yes, politics played in the debate as this became law, as my colleagues see, because we never got Congress to vote up or down on an assault rifle ban. We passed it in the House; we, those that were here at the time; but there were not the votes to pass it in the Senate.

Because of that, I say to the Members, we are fighting about Medicare, Medicaid, student loans and other issues today. We ought to repeal this nonsense. Let us support H.R. 125.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have the constitutional right to bear arms and the Government has the constitutional responsibility to regulate that right. Repeal of the assault weapons ban was not and is not part of the Contract With America. It never got past the first cut. Our Contract With America is about balancing our Federal budget, getting our financial house in order, saving our trust funds from bankruptcy for future generations, and transforming our caretaking, social and corporate welfare society into a caring opportunity society.

Logical gun control legislation and strong crime control are not mutually exclusive. We need both. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] opened this debate by saying that this was a choice between American values and Washington values. I agree, but not quite in the context in which he put it. It is a choice between American values, where 70 percent of the American public are saying keep these assault weapons banned, where the policemen of America are saying please keep these assault weapons banned. And Washington values, political payoffs to special interests, Republican payoffs to the NRA; that is what this is all about.

The Republican Party can no longer claim to be the party of law and order because they are saying if it is a choice between police and the NRA, they choose the NRA. This is a shame and a disgrace.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because Congress should not repeal a law which, based on the best information available to us, appears to be saving lives of Americans.

I come from a family of hunters in Minnesota, like many of my constituents, but this bill is not about weapons used to hunt animals. It is about allowing the proliferation of weapons which are today used to hunt human beings. I do not want my children and the other children in my district to live in that kind of a world.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the message in America is we want less guns in our communities. Every child is listening to that. Less guns, not more guns. Keep the promise to our children, vote ''no.''

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. So they want to repeal the assault weapons ban?

Mr. Speaker, I just passed through the hall, and I saw Sarah and Jim Brady out there, decent people. So my colleagues want to repeal it? All they have to do is walk past them, and it should teach them a lesson.

Look, if only one person in America is saved by gun control, I want to see every gun controlled because some of these people do not even need to have a gun in their hands, they are already bad enough without that.

So all over this country, those gun barons, they should go tell the NRA I said—Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are cutting off my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I appeal the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order. The time that was yielded to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I appeal the ruling because I was not given 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled, and the time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am owed more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will never shut up my mouth.

All I want to say is that I wish we could control these guns, and a ban on all these weapons is what America needs. So, if they want to repeal the assault weapons ban, they should go out in the hall and talk to Sarah and Jim Brady. My colleagues are behind the curve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers other than myself, and I reserve my time to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Of the 92 police officers that we have records of who were killed in the line of duty, 33 were killed by weapons that are covered in this bill, 33 of 92. Let me read their names: William Christian, Jr.——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEUTSCH. John J. Novabilski, April 26, 1995, John Norcross, April 20, 1995, John McLaughlin, April 20, 1995——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Timothy Howe, April 14, 1995, Daniel Doffyn, March 8, 1995——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Florida will be in order.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Henry J. Daly, Michael J. Miller, Martha Dixon-Martinez——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Florida is in violation of House rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is violating House rules. He ought to be escorted off the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is reminded that he has a responsibility to obey the rules of the House, and that display beyond the time recognized was outside the bounds of good judgment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] who opened this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for 15 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the few times the American people were proud of this body in the last few years is when we had the courage, the courage to override the special interests and pass the assault weapons ban. Let us not undo that. Let us stand tall, be proud, and do the right thing.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker. I rise in vehement opposition to H.R. 125, which would repeal a major part of the 1994 crime bill. The assault weapon ban is law today, and there is no compelling evidence that it should be repealed.

In 1994, I was one of a group of Republicans to advocate for a compromise crime bill that included the assault weapons ban. Part of that compromise was the authorization of a critical study that will tell Congress exactly how well the ban is working. This bill on the floor today contains a provision to terminate this study—forcing us to stick our heads in the sand when it comes to fully understanding the issue. This tells me that sponsors of this repeal don't even want to know the facts.

I firmly support the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms, but this right is not unlimited.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this misguided legislation is taking valuable time from our work on important issues. We still haven't finished last year's budget yet, and we have a lot of work to do on balancing the budget. We must pass real welfare reform, and address health care insurance reform which is needed to allow millions of Americans to obtain coverage.

I urge my colleagues to uphold this ban, and get back to our No. 1 proprity—balancing the budget.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the regular order of the House should be to uphold the assault weapons ban.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD].

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125, a measure that is consistent with the Republican majority's theme for the 104th Congress: ''Promises paid for, promises kept.''

Today's consideration of the assault weapons ban repeal fulfills the Republican leadership's commitment to the National Rifle Association, but is nothing short of a betrayal to the safety of the American public. Indeed, as characterized by an editorial in today's edition of the Los Angeles Times, in view of the likely Senate filibuster and a certain Presidential veto, this House vote is little more than a blatant special interest payback that has become the hallmark of the NRA.

The American people know that the violence that is ripping apart our families, classrooms, and communities throughout the Nation is nothing short of a crisis. That is why the polls have consistently shown that between 77 and 80 percent of Americans support an assault weapons ban. The ban is also supported by law enforcement agencies, including every police chief in my district. Whenever a law enforcement officer is shot, it is 18 times more likely that an assault weapon was used.

The reason the Republicans and the NRA are trying to overturn this Democratic-passed law is because the law is working. Attorney General Janet Reno has estimated that the number of assault weapons traced to crime has dropped 18 percent since the law took effect. In the past 2 years, thousands of people with criminals records have been denied access to these weapons.

That is why I supported the original assault weapons ban. I will vote against its repeal. This law balances the legitimate concerns of law-abiding gunowners against the need to take affirmative steps to curb senseless violence in our communities. The assault weapons ban is a carefully crafted compromise measure. It targets 19 specific styles of semi-automatic weapons, while exempting approximately 650 rifles and shotguns and privately owned assault weapons purchased before the bill's date of enactment. The banned assault weapons are not firearms that can be used for hunting and sporting purposes—they are designed to kill people and are the weapons of choice for street gangs and drug traffickers because they intimidate as efficiently as they kill.

At a time when drive-by shootings and the murder of innocent bystanders is on the rise, we must not retreat from this Congress' obligation to make our streets safer. I urge my colleagues to join forces with the enforcement organizations, medical associations, the American Bar Association, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Counties, among others, and defeat H.R. 125.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE]

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this outrageous bill.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for the American people, those here today and those listening to these proceedings, to recognize and to remember that protection of the American people, protection of our wives, our husbands, our children, our parents, our friends, and our associates is a bipartisan issue, and that is why the bill that we have here today is a bipartisan bill, a strong, a strong bipartisan bill because people on both sides of the aisle recognize that our Government is failing to perform.

Mr. Speaker, the protection of the American public is what this bill is all about. The people on the other side of the aisle think that they have a monopoly on people who have suffered, on people who continue to suffer, and on people who will suffer as a result of criminal activities against them, criminal actions against them.

Mr. Speaker, they do not have a monopoly. I would like them to hear about some people, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] knows,

because he was at the hearings, who have exhibited uncommon valor and a tremendous sense of courage when they came before our committee, when they came before the American people testified.

Were it not for, were it not for our ability to defend ourselves, Miss Sharon Ramboz of Maryland would be dead today, and her family. Mr. Charmaine Klaus from Waterford, MI, would be dead today, and his family. Mr. Phil Murphy from Tucson, AZ; and the list goes on and on. These are American people, husbands, wives, children, parents who need the protection afforded by our second amendment, and no Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, should belly up to the bar, should have to be defensive about standing up to our Constitution.

Support this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vehement opposition to the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act, H.R. 125. This bill is an abominable action that is a Republican assault on sane gun control laws. It is disgustingly apparent that H.R. 125 is motivated by the Republican juggernaut bank-rolled by the NRA.

H.R. 125 would repeal current law which prohibits the possession, manufacture, and transfer of many of the most egregious man-hunting weapons that proliferate American communities—TEC–9, Colt AR–15, and TEC–22. In a country where there is one gun per adult already in circulation—or 210 million guns—this repeal would be deadly.

Only in America is the safety of children, women, men, and families sacrificed for political, as well as economic profit. Most other industrialized countries have a virtual ban on handgun sales, which account for the vast difference in homicide rates between the United States and other nations. In 1990, handguns killed only 22 people in Great Britain, 13 in Sweden, 91 in Switzerland, 87 in Japan, 10 in Australia, and 68 in Canada. The United States infamous handgun fatalities statistic totaled 10,567.

Facts and compassion do not drive this Republican Congress. We should not be surprised by yet another affront to human decency and protection. Ironically, under this bill, the hunters will have their way. They will now be able to hunt with Uzi's and street sweepers. As ridiculous as this sounds, it is ridiculous to vote for H.R. 125. I strongly encourage my colleagues in the other chamber of Congress to oppose this travesty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 125, which would repeal the ban on assault weapons. I take this position today in response to concerns raised by the Guam chief of police, Jack S. Shimizu, who recently contacted me in opposition to the repeal on the ban on assault weapons.

Most police officers on the front lines of law enforcement on Guam will tell you the same thing. One of the Guam Police Department's biggest challenges is with the influx and use of ''ice.'' The violence and crime associated with the spread of ''ice'' is affecting our entire community and tearing families apart.

And any police officer will confirm the link between drugs and assault weapons. Assault weapons are the weapons of choice with these drug lords. They are not being used, nor necessary, for hunting. They are being used by drug lords simply to solidify their power to transport illegally ''ice'' into our island.

In order for the Guam Police Department to fight the island's war on ''ice,'' they need every tool at their disposal. The ban on assault weapons is not a panacea. It will not stop crime or crack down on illegal drugs in and of itself. But it is helpful and an additional tool in the arsenal of the police department.

I would like to submit for my colleagues' consideration a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Jack S. Shimizu, the chief of police at the Guam Police Department, for the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT OF GUAM,
GUAM POLICE DEPARTMENT,
GMF, Guam.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UNDERWOOD. On behalf of the Guam Police Department (GPD), I strongly urge you to relate GPD's opposition on the congressional bill for repealing the 1994 ban on assault weapons to the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives. As nearly every law enforcement agency and officer across the nation will tell you, such a repeal not only threatens any gains our department has made in the Territory's ''War on Ice and Dangerous Drugs'' but it heightens the danger our officers may face in confronting the criminal element engaged in drug trafficking who will be provided the opportunity to legitimately acquire such weapons if the ban is lifted.

Dangerous drugs and guns nearly always go hand in hand and the legitimate access to assault weapons by virtue of repealing such a ban does nothing more than provide the criminal element a legitimate way to outgun law enforcement. Therefore, I respectfully request that you make known GPD's opposition to the repeal attempt on the ban on assault weapons which serve no legitimate, practical or reasonable purpose.

Sincerely,

J.S. SHIMIZU.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, after careful deliberation, I supported the ban when the House approved it in 1994. My decision to vote in favor of the ban was not one that I made lightly. I was aware then, as I am now, that this ban is not perfect. But I came away from the debate 2 years ago with the belief that despite any flaws, this limited ban is a reasonable attempt to prevent the use of weapons that are designed solely for the destruction of human life.

Many factors went into my decision then which still apply today. The most significant of these factors was the support of the ban by both national and local law enforcement organizations and officials. In New York, this includes the Suffolk County Policemen's Benevolent Association, the Deputy Sheriff's Benevolent Association, the Superior Officers Association of Suffolk, the Police Conference of New York, as well as New York City's police commissioner and the president of New York City's Patrolman's Benevolent Association. National groups include the Fraternal Order of Police, with over 230,000 members, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officer's Association. All are experts on crime, and as a former criminal prosecutor, I respect their collective judgment on public safety. In addition, all living former Presidents support the ban.

I have been, and I remain, a staunch supporter of a law-abiding citizens' second amendment right to own a firearm. But as one who firmly believes in the sanctity of our Constitution, I simply do not believe that the second amendment, or any amendment to the Constitution is an unlimited right, and neither did the drafters. The freedoms of religion, speech, and the press are not absolute, and neither is the right to bear arms. With each of these sacred rights, exceptions are made in the most extreme cases. An individual cannot display obscene material, and the press cannot defame an individual. Likewise with the right to bear arms, I believe that this exception should be made in the case of a semiautomatic assault weapon. It for this reason I urge a ''no'' vote on the repeal of this ban.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the repeal of the ban on assault weapons. It is my wish that a police officer never has to confront a suspect armed with a firearm fitted with a grenade launcher, which is outlawed as part of the ban. It is difficult to imagine a legitimate purpose in private ownership of a grenade launcher.

The weapons identified in the ban are not uncommon on the streets of Dallas. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms estimates that there are two million military-style assault weapons on the streets today. Dallas narcotics officers have often encountered Intratec-9 firearms when executing a raid or apprehending a suspect. These firearms, with clips containing 32 rounds, have been the gun of choice for drug dealers. The Dallas Police Department has seized 24 Intratec-9's, 66 AK–47's and 3 street sweeper shotguns during 1995. These firearms are explicitly named in the ban.

Mr. Speaker, more than three-fourths of the American public support this ban. Adding provisions to this bill that increases penalties for gun related crimes is simply a gimmick to divert attention from this legislative payoff to the NRA, and will do nothing to stop those crimes if assault weapons are legally available again on the streets. Current law bans only a short list of specified semiautomatic assault weapons—weapons used almost exclusively by organized crime, gangs, and drug cartels—while specifically exempting more than 650 sporting firearms from the ban.

Statistics show that even though these assault weapons make up less than 1 percent of all guns, they are 18 times more likely than other guns to be cop-killers, and 16 times more likely to be traced to crime than other firearms. Police support outlawing assault weapons in order to protect the lives of police, as well as the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to uphold the ban.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I came to the floor to fight for a ban on assault weapons. At that time, I told the story of Michelle Cutner, a 7-year-old from Philadelphia. It was the next to the last day of school and Michelle's mother picked her up at the Chester Elementary School. As she stopped at a corner store to buy chips, Jerome Whitaker, a 15-year-old who was quarreling with a friend, took out a TEC–9 and started shooting. One of the bullets hit Michelle and killed her. The carnage continues in Philadelphia. Four months ago, three young friends sitting in a minivan were riddled with 40 rounds of gunfire from a semiautomatic rifle while sitting in a van. One of the victims, Joseph Gill, was 16 years old.

Mr. Speaker, how many more little girls like Michelle have to die from the bullet of a TEC–9? How many more young men will die in a hail of bullets? How many more police officers will be gunned down because bulletproof vests cannot resist the spray of AK–47's or Uzi's? I urge my colleagues to join me on behalf of kids like Michelle and Joseph, and so many others like them, and vote against this assault on the assault weapons ban.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125, an attempt by the gun lobby to throw away proven legislation enacted by Congress to save the lives of U.S. citizens and police officers. If the gun lobby has its way, there will be no more assault weapons ban, but there will be a lot more bloodshed.

The survival of assault weapons is completely dependent on the campaign funds of the gun lobby—bought lock, stock, and barrel. This allusion is to the three main components of a gun which together comprise essentially the entire weapon. That is what comes to mind when I think of the gun lobby's partnership with assault weapons advocates.

The misleading statements about second amendment rights by the gun lobby should not obscure the fact that the majority of Americans, including gun owners, want assault weapons off our streets and out of our school yards.

Clearly, the assault weapons ban is working to reduce bloodshed and save lives. The city of Chicago, for instance, seized 127 assault weapons in the first 6 months of 1995—almost a 50-percent decline from the first 6 months of 1994.

Simply put, there is no justification for repealing the assault weapons ban. It is unthinkable that in our society, we would allow citizens to walk the streets armed with guns equipped with hand grenade launchers, flash suppressors, and bayonet mounts.

It is important to make clear that the assault weapons ban has not in any way taken guns out of the hands of any law abiding citizen because all it does is stop the manufacture and importation of these killing machines.

And while I support the use of assault weapons to arm certain law enforcement officials and military personnel in areas like Bosnia and other hostile areas, it is clear that no one needs an AK–47 assault rifle or a TEC–9 assault pistol to defend their home or go deer hunting. They are simply designed to kill large numbers of people quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand up to the gun lobby and oppose H.R. 125 to stop further bloodshed at the hands of violent criminals, and instead, to save the lives of our citizens and our brave police officers.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the banning of certain types of guns is an infringement on the rights of citizens to protect their families.

Criminals who want to use such weapons can continue to obtain them illegally.

Military-style weapons are involved in less than a fraction of all serious crime, and the assault weapons ban does not keep crime off the streets.

Taking away the rights of law-abiding citizens to own firearms is not the answer to stopping crime.

The crime bill passed, because it contained many provisions to help small communities in fighting crime, but it went too far in criminalizing these weapons.

I have always opposed banning certain types of weapons, and this law must be repealed, because it criminalizes otherwise law-abiding citizens.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, why are we attempting to repeal a ban that is supported by an overwhelming majority of the American people—and is saving lives?

In the year following the ban's enactment there was an 18 percent drop in the number of assault weapons linked to crimes. Repealing this ban will ensure more bloodshed and more lives lost. Poll after poll has shown that 80 percent of the American public consistently supports this ban.

It is ludicrous for the House to vote against the wishes of 80 percent of the American people. It is a travesty to repeal a law that saves lives.

Attached is a letter from the chief of police of Downey, CA.

CITY OF DOWNEY,
December 7, 1995.

Congressman STEVE HORN,
4010 Watson Plaza Drive, #160,
Lakewood, CA.

DEAR STEVE: I have been told that Congressman Gingrich will be asking for a vote to repeal the assault weapons ban. I would strongly urge you not to support any type of vote that would weaken or repeal the current state of the law.

Enclosed is a letter of support I sent to Senator Feinstein earlier this year. It makes no difference whose name gets plugged in, as from my point of view it is absolutely irresponsible to consider support of H.R. 1488, the repeal of the assault weapons ban.

I trust you take the time to contact all the Los Angeles County Chiefs of Police. You will find total support of the current law.

Yours for professional law enforcement.

GREGORY C. CALDWELL,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF DOWNEY,
April 3, 1995.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
11111 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 915,
Los Angeles, CA.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I appreciate your asking for my input regarding Senator Dole's position on repealing the ''ill conceived'' gun ban passed as part of last year's crime bill.

As a 28-year law enforcement professional I feel I could speak volumes on gun control and the issues associated with gun control. However, I do not feel that is too important at this time. It seems that getting to the point is what is important.

If Senator Dole believes that any portion of the current gun ban is ''ill conceived,'' I find it most difficult to find words to describe Senator Dole's thoughts to repeal. I must presume that Senator Dole has laid down his soul and good judgment to the National Rifle Association. That is truly unfortunate for a man of seemingly such good character and thought.

Again, recognizing all the present arguments, please allow an emotional argument or question. Knowing that military-style assault weapons fit the needs of sporting America, especially those urban hunters bent on human destruction,will Senator Dole help? Will Senator Dole come out and help our local cops clean up the mess of these urban hunters? Will the NRA help? Oh, excuse me, I forgot—guns don't kill, people kill.

Senator Feinstein, keep up the fight against allowing the manufacture, sale or transfer of military-style assault weapons, copycat models and the ammunition clip guidelines. If anything, the current controls should be just a baseline because they are not yet enough.

We have a tough job fighting off politicians who are willing to sell out to the NRA hiding behind the Constitution. As long as we have these sellouts, our urban hunters will continue to have great success.

If I can be of any other help regarding this issue or more responsible gun control issues, please feel free to call on me.

Yours for professional law enforcement.

GREGORY C. CALDWELL,
Chief of Police.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill to repeal the ban on certain types of assault weapons.

This proposal carries great importance to my constituents in the 19th District of California. Many of the men and women I represent live in remote areas. ''911'' does not insure an instant emergency response for them. Lives are at stake here, Mr. Chairman, and it is essential that we move to protect those who legally try to protect themselves.

Althouth the framers of our Constitution hardly envisioned a society so besieged with violence as our current culture, they understood the constant need to be on guard, to defend our liberties.

If we were to infringe on the American public's right to bear arms, surely that would be to breach the spirit of our laws and the essence of our Constitution's second amendment. That provision of the Bill of Rights is explicit.

A vote to repeal the weapons ban is my vote of confidence in America's Constitution and America's people. In passing this legislation today, Congress demonstrates a respect for the integrity of those who penned the words of our country's most profound accomplishment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation sponsored by Congressman JIM CHAPMAN which would repeal the assault weapons ban included in the comprehensive anti-crime package of 1994.

Voting on this issue is not difficult for me, because I strongly believe that my position on this legislation is correct. I opposed the assault weapons ban in 1994 when it came up as part of the crime bill, and I still oppose the ban.

The ban, one of the most controversial parts of the 1994 anticrime law, was ill-conceived and poorly drafted. The ban has burdened the rights of the American people to own guns, but has had no effect on crime.

This bill not only repeals the onerous ban, it also gets tougher on criminals. Instead of imposing more limits on law-abiding citizens, the bill goes in the other direction and slaps tougher penalties on criminals who use a firearm while committing a violent Federal crime.

The current ban arbitrarily restricts certain weapons, since it is virtually impossible to distinguish a semiautomatic assault weapon from other semiautomatic weapons that are used for sport and hunting. The features designated in the 1994 crime law that define which weapons are banned and merely cosmetic, and have no effect on the action of the firearm. Any firearm—banned or not—is equally capable of being abused by criminals or madmen, or used by law-abiding citizens for self protection or hunting. And, according to the FBI, all types of military-style weapons are involved in less than 1 percent of all murders and less than 1 percent of all serious crime.

No matter how much we all want to halt violent crimes committed with firearms, the fact is that banning certain firearms will do nothing to stop these tragic crimes. Studies overwhelmingly show that gun control laws—like those which ban all guns in Washington, DC, which has a very high gun-related crime rate—have no impact on stopping criminals from obtaining whatever firearm is necessary for perpetrating their crimes. The ban on semi-automatic assault weapons simply kept certain guns from law-abiding citizens, but has done nothing to disarm criminals.

Mr. Speaker, as a former police officer and the father of a police officer, I can testify that unlike the current ban, this bill will take steps to get violent criminals off the street. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Chapman bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have long championed our second amendment right to bear arms. Time after time, I have voted against misguided attempts to limit or restrict our rights to buy and own guns or ammunition. As you may know, I have strongly opposed and voted against both the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban.

I have always been a strong supporter of law enforcement but I believe that we need to solve our crime problems directly and not by curbing the constitutionally protected rights of law abiding citizens. The ban on semi-automatic weapons will not stop criminals from procuring these firearms. The only people who will not have access to illegal weapons are law abiding citizens. Our Federal Government needs to protect law abiding citizens and not take away their means with which to protect themselves. It is for these reasons that I support efforts to repeal the assault weapons ban.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment with the majority leadership of this Congress for revisiting the assault weapons ban which passed the House in 1994. I think it fair to say that we are considering legislation to repeal the law today because the majority leaders ''owe'' the gun lobby. This is just one more example of how our agenda is being driven by interest groups with big pacs.

I am also shocked that the leadership has so thoroughly circumvented the committee process on this legislation. We should have had hearings. Before we consider repealing the law we should first know if it has been successful. What do our police officers think? Do they want to see the ban repealed? Has it helped save lives? Has it been effective? It is absolutely absured and outrageous that there has been no consideration or debate of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in self-defense. However, I do not believe one needs an AK–47 to defend himself. AK–47s can shoot 106 rounds in 2 minutes. They are high speed machine guns that have been used for shooting sprees. Patrick Purdy, using an AK–47, killed 5 small children and their teacher, while wounding 29 others on a playground in stockton, CA. What about the defense of these children? Whose concern is that? Those of use and who support the assault weapons ban are trying to make the would a little safer for our children.

Furthermore, every major national law enforcement organization in the country supports a ban on semi-automatic assault weapons. These are the cops on the beat in Miami and Ft. Lauderdale. They see no purpose for assault weapons, and I trust their judgment. I support the men and women who are fighting crime on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote we have to ask ourselves if we want a society that permits the sale of machine guns or we want a society that controls gratuitous weapons? A majority of Americans agree with me, Mr. Speaker. They believe in reducing bloodshed and saving lives. They support the ban on assault weapons and so should this Congress.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we are here today as a gesture.

An extreme gesture, to be sure, but a gesture nonetheless.

It is not a gesture to the American people. Seventy percent of the American people support the assault weapons ban.

It is not a gesture to law enforcement. Every major law enforcement group in the country wants Uzi and Street Sweepers off the streets.

In fact, the Attorney General's office says that crimes involving assault weapons were down 18.4 percent during the first 8 months of the ban.

It is not even a legislative gesture, because this legislative proposal is going nowhere. The Senate won't go along with it. Everyone knows that. And even if it does, President Clinton will veto it to protect Americans from rapid fire weapons designed to kill.

So let's be very clear about the meaning of this gesture. It is a political gesture, because the people who currently control the House of Representatives are paying off an IOU to one interest group, the National Rifle Association.

I support the second amendment. I support the exercise of rights under that amendment. The assault weapons ban does not interfere with the rights of hunters and the right of self defense. But as a number of police chiefs have told me, assault weapons involved here are weapons of war. It is an extreme position to defend their general ownership in a civil society.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the vote on repeal of assault weapons is not an easy vote. The reason is there are strong philosophical and practical arguments on both sides. On the one hand, we have the second amendment of the U.S. Constitution which protects the citizen's right to bear arms. This is an outgrowth of the fact that for centuries authoritarian governments maintained their power over the populace through the banning of weapons. We may look to Scotland, where in the early 14th century William Wallace led the Scottish freedom uprising against the British. The Scots were forced to use rocks, and homemade weapons because the English had banned Scots from having arms.

The other side of the issue can be looked at from the view of the proper role of government. As John Locke pointed out in 1689 in his ''Second Treatise on Civil Government,'' a document that was the intellectual underpinning of our own Constitution, the reason we form governments is to protect life, liberty, and property. Anarchy leads to the strong coercing the weak. In order to reduce the total amount of coercion in society we give up the legal use of force to a government whose function is to protect each individual citizen from one another. The question then becomes, does the ban on assault weapons provide an efficient and reasonable means of protecting individuals from threat of force by other individuals? Again, we may look to Scotland, where just last week several children were killed before the police were able to intervene. Does the ban on assault weapons effectively reduce the chances that you will be coerced by another armed citizen?

The tradeoff is between our constitutional right to bear arms and the reason for government in the first place: protection of life, liberty, and property. Those of us who feel our right to bear arms is diminished greatly by the banning of these weapons and that the threat to our person from our fellow citizens is little reduced by the ban will vote for the bill. Those who feel these weapons add little to our freedom to protect ourselves from our government and that the existence of these weapons threatens our personal safety will vote against the bill. For many of us, the evidence is not clear on either side. On the whole, I believe there is strong evidence that crime will be reduced by getting tougher on the criminal that is committing the crime, rather then focusing on the weapon they use. This legislation does this by establishing strong minimum mandatory sentences for criminals who use firearms in the commission of Federal crimes and requiring the Attorney General to order each U.S. attorney to designate at least one assistant U.S. attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals, and makes sure the Department of Justice prosecutes armed violent criminals. Thus I will vote for the bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125. Congress addressed this issue on a bipartisan basis and enacted the assault weapons ban in 1994. Today, just over 1 year later, we are back to square one—not because this law has caused some sort of hardship for the American people, but because of strictly partisan politics. The Republican leadership is repaying a political debt to the National Rifle Association [NRA].

Since the enactment of this law I have yet to hear of an incident of hardship on sportsmen or women—no hunters have missed deer season because they couldn't buy a TEC–DC9 or an AK–47. The simple fact is that the assault weapon ban works as intended—to keep military weapons off the streets of our communities and out of the hands of criminals.

Annually, 22 million households are affected by crime. Violent crime has increased 25 percent in the past 5 years. Today, criminals ironically are often better equipped with unregulated para-military weapons than our police officers who are trying to maintain law and order on our streets. Unfortunately, guns are appearing in our schools. Gang violence is spreading beyond the troubled city areas. Citizens are justifiably upset about the erosion of public safety and they are right in demanding that something be done about it.

The law which the Republican leadership is sacrificing at the alter of the NRA bans dangerous and destructive military-style weapons. It saves lives and bans semi-automatic weapons that can be easily converted into machine guns. There are the weapons of choice of naive and hardened law breakers. Human assault weapons—people-killing weapons—must be kept out of hands of the deranged, malevolent, and malcontent. Such weapons cause carnage on the streets of our Nation and they must be removed to stop the escalation and cycle of homicide that has tragically come to be the poster which too often today symbolizes life in the United States. Certainly the right to bear arms does not mean you should

be able to run abound with a grenade launcher, street sweeper, or other military hardware. The primary purpose, perhaps the only purpose, of these assault type military weapons is the assault on another person, and there is no place on our streets for such a weapon.

The 1994 assault weapon ban is a positive element in an overall effort to reduce violence in our society. Congress in not obligated to the special interest groups such as the NRA and must respond to facts not fears—we must say no to the repeal and yes to the commonsense rules and laws of a civilized society. Congress is obligated to the people of this Nation and to our law enforcement officials, who overwhelmingly support the ban on assault weapons, to take these guns off the street and out of the hands of criminals.

This law works to save lives, to make our lives and that of those we represent safer. What kind of message will we send if today this House disregards the public's view and acts with disdain to symbolically strike down this commonsense law. This action, this process, this proposal is the type of action that causes the people we represent to hold this Congress in such disdain—special interest dominated and the public interest disregarded.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this shortsighted and destructive legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the assault weapons ban was political theater by the Democrats. It was brought to the floor and passed because the President's pollster said it would be a hot issue for Democrats in the fall election. Repealing the ban is equally cynical political theater by the Republicans.

The fact is that the assault weapons ban has done nothing to stem violent crime. By the same token, it has caused little or no significant inconvenience for gun owners. I saw no reason to enact the ban in the first place and voted against it; I see no reason to continue this debate over symbolic measures here today. I'll oppose this repeal effort for the same reason I opposed the ban in the first place: it is symbol over substance. What we do here today will have little effect on violent crime and little effect on the rights of lawful gun owners.

After this meaningless debate is behind us, I'll continue to support the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms. And I'll continue my staunch support for measures that will stop violent crime and put criminals who use guns behind bars for a very long time.

When the so-called assault weapons ban was first before the House, I voted against it. I said then and I'll say today that banning these weapons would do nothing to reduce violent crime in America. In fact, the ban didn't ban much of anything.

Consider this: the assault weapons ban specifically prohibits sale of the Colt AR–15, which is capable of firing up to 30 rounds of .223 caliber ammunition, each shot requiring a squeeze of the trigger. However, the bill specifically allows the continued sale of the Ruger Mini–14, which is capable of firing up to 30 rounds of .223 caliber ammunition, each shot requiring a squeeze of the trigger. The only difference between the two is that the Colt rifle looks more threatening. The ultimate irony, of course, is that the assault weapons ban didn't even make it illegal to sell AR–15's or any of the other weapons supposedly banned by the bill. It merely prohibited their future manufacture and made existing stocks more expensive.

In January of this year a man walked into an office building in Portland, OR, carrying a supposedly banned AK–47. He shot two people and took a number of others hostage before being apprehended by the police. Thankfully, no one was killed. The story is interesting for two reasons. First, he was using a supposedly banned assault rifle that he had legally purchased in 1995—after the assault weapons ban took effect. Second, he could just as easily have been using an equally dangerous rifle like the Ruger Mini–14, which was not banned by the so-called assault weapons ban.

If this repeal is adopted today, next year or the year after another ban will be offered that could be even more intrusive to legitimate gun owners. So let's quit kidding the American people into thinking this charade means anything. The debate here today is about people's emotions, not about measures that will actually reduce violent crime.

First, our system of justice must provide stiff sentences for criminals who use guns and for multiple violent offenders. Our communities desperately need more police on the streets. Unfortunately, Republican leaders are doing everything they can to cut funding we passed to put 100,000 new cops on the street.

Equally important, however, is a commitment to early intervention and prevention for at-risk youth. Until we as a society can begin to undo the harm that has been done to the hopes of millions of Americans, violent crime will almost certainly continue to plague us.

Let's do the people's business here and quit playing these cynical political games. Let's stop the debate over symbol and move on to substance.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member supports certain provisions of H.R. 125 that increase the mandatory minimum sentences for committing crimes while possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm. Tough penalties are certainly needed. However, these provisions are not enough to change his support for the assault weapons ban. This Member previously voted for a ban on the manufacture and import of certain assault weapons because that was the rational, responsible, and constitutional thing to do. Furthermore, over 72 percent of the residents of the First Congressional District of Nebraska supported this vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 338, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

☐ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—239

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder

Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—173

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Studds
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Calvert
Clay
Collins (IL)
Cox
Cunningham
Dreier
Gibbons
Johnston
Lewis (CA)
McKeon
Moakley
Moorhead
Myers
Radanovich
Schroeder
Shaw
Stark
Stokes
Waters

□ 1401

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Radanovich for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Johnston against.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. TAUZIN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1996 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2854, FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight Monday, March 25, 1996, to file the conference report on H.R. 2854, the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1833, PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–492) on the resolution (H. Res. 389) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas the schedule for this week and next week.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded our legislative business for the week and I am happy to announce that the Members are now free to return to their districts and families.

Next Monday, March 25, the House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m. There will be no legislative business that day.

On Tuesday, March 26, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for business to consider a number of suspensions, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 146, 1996 Special Olympics Torch Relay;

H. Con. Res. 147, 1996 National Peace Officers' Memorial Service;

H. Res. 345, expressing concern about the deterioration of human rights in Cambodia;

H. Res. 379, expressing the Sense of the House concerning the anniversary of the massacre of Kurds by the Iraqi Government;

H. Con. Res. 102, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i Community;

H.J. Res. 158, to recognize the Peace Corps on the occasion of the 35th anniversary and the Americans who have served as Peace Corps volunteers; and

H.R. 3121, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

If any recorded votes are ordered on Tuesday, they will be held until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, March 27.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will dispose of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1833, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act.

On Thursday, March 28 the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up the conference report to H.R. 2854, the Agricultural Market Transition Act, and also H.R. 3103, the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996.

On Friday, March 29, it is our hope that the House will consider an appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. We will also consider a bill to increase the debt ceiling.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his information.

Mr. Speaker, I just have two questions. Does the gentleman anticipate bringing up the product liability bill next week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, we do not know that, but the gentleman knows that a conference report can be brought up at any time.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me then ask the gentleman, your leadership has announced that the Passover/Easter recess would begin next Friday. Can you give assurances to the House that we will complete business by next Friday? Or is there still some thought that we may in fact have to go into the weekend or the following week?

Mr. DELAY. I think the gentleman knows that we are trying to put 1996 behind us as far as the spending and debt limit is concerned. Unless the President vetoes those two bills, we expect to be out by no later than 6 p.m. on Friday.