

fair structured rule. That will certainly be the first taken up.

Mr. BONIOR. Wednesday maybe for that bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. Excuse me?

Mr. BONIOR. Is the gentleman from New York anticipating maybe Wednesday for that particular bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes.

Mr. BONIOR. OK.

Mr. SOLOMON. And we are uncertain as to which of the next two would be brought up first, the ban on partial-birth abortions and the resolution providing amounts for the expenses of certain House committees for the 105th Congress. They both will most likely be brought up on Thursday.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I was delighted to hear my friend from New York say that the flexibility bill would be brought up under a fair structured rule, obviously meaning amendments would be allowed.

May I safely assume that the other two important bills would also be brought up under fair structured rules and allowing amendments that week?

Mr. SOLOMON. I can assure the gentleman. He knows that I made a personal commitment, as did Speaker GINGRICH, that we would be at least as fair as the Democrats were always to us and probably much fairer.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield again, I am glad to know he is flexible. May I ask my question again? The gentleman said there would be a fair structured rule. Does that mean that there would also be a fair structured rule of the same sort to the other bills?

Mr. SOLOMON. I would think so, although we have a fair Committee on Rules and we always take the minority in consultation, and we will have to make that decision. I certainly do not want to speak for all nine of them.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. We will settle for the gentleman's commitment.

Mr. SOLOMON. My commitment is always to be fair.

Mr. BONIOR. I just want the gentleman to understand on the committee funding bill there is an immense amount of controversy on that bill and concern on our side with respect to the division of funding, and I hope it is not the last thing we do before we break for spring because I just want the gentleman to be aware that there are very strong feelings by our ranking and senior Members with respect to the funding of that bill.

So I hope we can work some things out next week on it, but if we cannot, I do not think it would be wise to make that the last order of business.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just mention that the gentleman was patient in the debate we had this afternoon with respect to the paperwork re-

duction bill, specifically the previous question that dealt with campaign finance reform. I just want the gentleman to know with the deepest amount of respect how strongly we feel on our side of the aisle about that bill, about having—not that bill, that process, and having something coming to the floor. We can discuss a variety of bills and approaches, and we will be pressing that—as the gentleman probably was able to ascertain from our efforts today, we will be pressing that on a regular basis, and we are hopeful that in a fair, bipartisan manner we can have this out on the floor where we get a full debate and we can do it in a timely fashion.

Now we do not expect it to be done next week or perhaps within the next month. We expect some idea of when we as a body can address this issue, which is a growing cancer on the Democratic institution that we love so much here.

So I just want the gentleman to know up front where we are coming from, if he has not figured it out, and I am sure he has by now, about how strongly we feel about this, and I thank him so much.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, first of all I want to thank him for thanking me for being patient this afternoon. Sometimes that is hard to do, but we certainly are trying to have some comity in the House that will allow us to have meaningful work produced, and, as the gentleman knows, campaign finance reform is a very complex and important issue.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, whichever way one looks at it, we are bound by the U.S. Constitution. There are people like me that would like to bring a bill to the floor yesterday for full financial disclosure on everything, and I feel very strongly about that, just as strongly as the gentleman does on other aspects. But because it is complex, because we are bound by the Constitution, we have to make sure that what we do is going to stand the constitutional test, and that is going to take some time, but I do believe that this issue is going to be dealt with, and the gentleman has my assurances to help him make sure that we bring a meaningful bill to the floor that can be enforced, not like the present laws, which have been broken, as the gentleman knows, and which need to be enforced.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and I would say in just brief response that it is just not a bill that we are interested in. We are interested in having their idea come to the floor as well as the myriad of ideas that we have out here to resolve this. The Senate is already moving on dealing with a constitutional amendment, and it seems to me that we ought to be at least discussing when, in fact, we will have our day. I frankly think this needs a week, a full week at least, of discussion on the floor because of its importance to the Democratic process

and our lives, and our lives, which in many ways are out of control because of what we have got to go through, the hurdles that all of us have to go through, to compete in this insane system that we are living in.

So I thank my colleague, and I want to make sure that his disclosure bill has an opportunity, and I may indeed support it, but I think other opportunities ought to be available as well, and we wish the gentleman from New York a good weekend.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I also want to say this is my day to be delighted at the resolution of my friend from New York. I was particularly pleased to hear him pledge absolute fealty to the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution as governing what we do, and I look forward to our being very closely governed by what the Supreme Court says we can and cannot do for the rest of the year.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will just yield further, I know Members probably want to go home for the evening, but I am just sure that no American expects a doctor to prescribe surgery until he has done a thorough examination, and I am going to tell the gentleman my colleagues all know I have been very much involved in what has been going on with what I consider scandals on not only breaking campaign laws. Those are very important laws. As my colleague knows, one single little violation is subject to a \$5,000 fine and/or 5 years in jail and, lord knows, there have been so many violations, and we really need to get to the bottom of those, see what it is, and I think that will lead us into maybe some meaningful legislation to perhaps correct some of those illegal activities that have been going on.

And I thank the gentleman, and I wish him a very happy weekend as well.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 17, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,
MARCH 18, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 17, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 18, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.