

and I for one cannot turn my back on the valiant police officers in my district in New York City and Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues, do not defile the memory of those who died in the massacre on the Long Island Railroad. Do not sell your vote for the blood money of the NRA. Listen to the painful and courageous cries of the victims, your constituents and our police officers, law enforcement officials, and not to the special interests and the blood money of the NRA.

#### EVERGLADES RESTORATION

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to yell today. I want to thank this Chamber. I want to thank the conferees of the Senate and the House who have agreed to put \$200 million in the budget for the Everglades restoration in Florida. The administration proposed a tax to fund the Everglades restoration. We proposed a solution, an immediate infusion of \$200 million, plus vital lands to protect the fragile Everglades in Florida, protecting water supplies, protecting our second largest national park, and doing so in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, particularly Speaker GINGRICH, Senators DOLE and MACK, and the 299 Members of this House who supported the efforts of environmental protection. This Congress, when it wants to, can work together in a bipartisan spirit. I hope we do more bipartisan efforts in the future in order to bring this Nation to the point of pride that it once was where it can restore the pride in ourselves and our abilities to govern, lower the rhetoric, lower the anxiety and allow us to proceed in an orderly fashion for democracy.

#### TITLE I EDUCATION FUNDING

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 days from now, the State of Georgia could begin laying off teachers due to Republican cuts to title I education funding. According to the Republicans, these cuts are necessary to balance the budget. Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time believing that. Especially when those same Republicans increased military spending by \$7 billion for pork-barrel projects the Pentagon didn't ask for.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, today's budget impasse is a direct result of Republicans insisting on \$177 billion in tax breaks skewed to the wealthy. It's no wonder Congress' approval rating is so low.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the GOP plans to deal with declining geography test-scores by reducing school funding,

so we can buy the bombs necessary to eliminate the countries our children can't find on a map anyway.

I guess that's one way of boosting geography test scores.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, I was unavoidably detained from the House floor and missed four RECORD votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 56, "no"; rollcall 57, "yes"; rollcall 58, "yes"; and rollcall 59, I would have voted "no."

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1202

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1202.

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

There was no objection.

#### GUN BAN REPEAL ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 388

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 125) to repeal the ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Chapman of Texas or Representative Barr of Georgia and Representative Conyers of Michigan or his designee. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of

the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act under a closed rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report accompanying the rule is considered as adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would favor a more open process, but this particular bill presents issues which have been widely debated, which every Member of this body understands thoroughly. Most Members were familiar with the issues in this bill before they were even sworn in as Members of the House. While this particular bill was not reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, subcommittee hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary were held on the subject of this bill, extensive hearings.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents. The proponents' time will be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] on a bipartisan basis, thus ensuring both parties will be fairly represented. The time of the opponents will be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. In the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Michigan agreed that he would provide half of the time in opposition to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and other Republicans, thus insuring an equal division of time among the parties on both sides of this issue so we can be sure that this is going to be a fair and open debate.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may only be offered by the minority leader, or his designee. This means that the minority will have the opportunity to get a vote on their best alternative proposal, and that is as it should be, Mr. Speaker.

This is a fair rule which will allow the House to consider a highly contentious issue in a balanced way and still enable Members to have time to return to their districts in time to meet with their constituents this weekend, and it is an important weekend coming up.

It is no secret that I have long been a proponent of the right of law-abiding citizens to have firearms to protect themselves, which is especially important in rural areas such as the 10,000 square miles in rural New York that I represent. It has frequently been said that guns do not commit crimes, people commit those crimes, and when people commit crimes, no matter what the weapon, we should throw the book at them, and that is what this bill does.

This bill does two things. It increases the penalties on those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of violent Federal crime or Federal drug traffic offenses, and it also contains provisions repealing the ineffective ban on certain semiautomatic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the ban on certain semiautomatic weapons has not been

effective in stopping crime anywhere in this country. No one has been prosecuted under the 1½-year-old statute that banned magazines, and fewer than three people have been prosecuted for violating the States' semiautomatic firearms ban. Think about that. More than 85 percent of the semiautomatic firearms banned under the 1994 law are rifles, the type of firearms least likely to be used in the commission of any crime. According to FBI uniform crime reports, rifles of any description, including those the law defines as so-called assault weapons, are used in, listen to this, less than 3 percent of homicides every year, less than 3 percent. In other words it is totally irrelevant.

Banning guns does not reduce violent crime. Prosecuting violent criminals and putting them behind bars is the only proven method for controlling violent crime. Historically throughout the history of this country that is true. States with the highest increases in imprisonment rates are among the States with the greatest decreases in violent crime. That is a fact. And those jurisdictions with the most restrictive gun controls, like right here in Washington, DC, continue to register the highest per capita homicide rates, the most murders than anywhere else in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the inescapable conclusion is that the way to stop crime is to

put the criminals in prison, not take away from law-abiding citizens the right to defend themselves from criminals. Therefore, I would ask for a yes vote on the previous question on this rule, a yes vote on adoption of the rule, so that the House may proceed expeditiously to consider the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act. That is what we are here to do today, we have a commitment to bring this bill to the floor, and, regardless how my colleagues feel about it, it lets them vote their own conscience.

That is what this bill is all about.

#### THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 21, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup> .....	46	44	59	60
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup> .....	49	47	24	25
Closed <sup>4</sup> .....	9	9	15	15
Total .....	104	100	98	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

#### SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 21, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) .....	O	H.R. 5 .....	Unfunded Mandate Reform .....	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) .....	MC	H. Con. Res. 17 .....	Social Security .....	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1 .....	Balanced Budget Amdt .....	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) .....	O	H.R. 101 .....	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) .....	O	H.R. 400 .....	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) .....	O	H.R. 440 .....	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif .....	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) .....	O	H.R. 2 .....	Line Item Veto .....	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) .....	O	H.R. 665 .....	Victim Restitution .....	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) .....	O	H.R. 666 .....	Exclusionary Rule Reform .....	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) .....	MO	H.R. 667 .....	Violent Criminal Incarceration .....	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) .....	O	H.R. 668 .....	Criminal Alien Deportation .....	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) .....	MO	H.R. 728 .....	Law Enforcement Block Grants .....	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) .....	MO	H.R. 7 .....	National Security Revitalization .....	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) .....	MC	H.R. 831 .....	Health Insurance Deductibility .....	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95) .....	O	H.R. 830 .....	Paperwork Reduction Act .....	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) .....	MC	H.R. 889 .....	Defense Supplemental .....	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) .....	MO	H.R. 450 .....	Regulatory Transition Act .....	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) .....	MO	H.R. 1022 .....	Risk Assessment .....	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) .....	O	H.R. 926 .....	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act .....	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) .....	MO	H.R. 925 .....	Private Property Protection Act .....	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) .....	MO	H.R. 1058 .....	Securities Litigation Reform .....	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) .....	MO	H.R. 988 .....	Attorney Accountability Act .....	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) .....	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) .....	Debate	H.R. 956 .....	Product Liability Reform .....	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) .....	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) .....	MO	H.R. 1159 .....	Making Emergency Supp. Approps .....	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) .....	MC	H.J. Res. 73 .....	Term Limits Const. Amdt .....	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) .....	Debate	H.R. 4 .....	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 .....	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95) .....	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95) .....	O	H.R. 1271 .....	Family Privacy Protection Act .....	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95) .....	O	H.R. 660 .....	Older Persons Housing Act .....	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95) .....	MC	H.R. 1215 .....	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 .....	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95) .....	MC	H.R. 483 .....	Medicare Select Expansion .....	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95) .....	O	H.R. 655 .....	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 .....	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95) .....	O	H.R. 1361 .....	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996 .....	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95) .....	O	H.R. 961 .....	Clean Water Amendments .....	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95) .....	O	H.R. 535 .....	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas .....	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95) .....	O	H.R. 584 .....	Fish Hatchery—Iowa .....	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95) .....	O	H.R. 614 .....	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota .....	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95) .....	MC	H. Con. Res. 67 .....	Budget Resolution FY 1996 .....	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95) .....	MO	H.R. 1561 .....	American Overseas Interests Act .....	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95) .....	MC	H.R. 1530 .....	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95) .....	O	H.R. 1817 .....	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996 .....	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95) .....	MC	H.R. 1854 .....	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95) .....	O	H.R. 1868 .....	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95) .....	O	H.R. 1905 .....	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996 .....	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95) .....	C	H.J. Res. 79 .....	Flag Constitutional Amendment .....	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95) .....	MC	H.R. 1944 .....	Emer. Supp. Approps .....	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95) .....	O	H.R. 1977 .....	Interior Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95) .....	O	H.R. 1977 .....	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2 .....	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95) .....	O	H.R. 1976 .....	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95) .....	O	H.R. 2020 .....	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95) .....	C	H.J. Res. 96 .....	Disapproval of MFN to China .....	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95) .....	O	H.R. 2002 .....	Transportation Approps. FY 1996 .....	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95) .....	O	H.R. 70 .....	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil .....	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95) .....	O	H.R. 2076 .....	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996 .....	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95) .....	O	H.R. 2099 .....	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996 .....	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95) .....	MC	S. 21 .....	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia .....	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95) .....	O	H.R. 2126 .....	Defense Approps. FY 1996 .....	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95) .....	MC	H.R. 1555 .....	Communications Act of 1995 .....	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95) .....	O	H.R. 2127 .....	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996 .....	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).

## SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of March 21, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth.	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251-157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/19/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/21/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules met yesterday afternoon to consider this rule, I made two points I feel are worth repeating here for the benefit of all Members of the House.

The first point relates directly to the consideration of the ban on assault weapons. In the 103d Congress, I believe a serious error was made when the House was not given the opportunity to take a final up or down vote on this issue. Given the controversy surrounding issues relating to gun ownership, these issues should be addressed directly, not buried in other legislative proposals, as was the assault weapon ban in 1994. Consequently, the desire of a great many Members to have a direct vote on this issue is understandable.

However, it is how we are getting to this direct vote that I find peculiar and out of the ordinary. I noted yesterday afternoon that it is unusual, though not unheard of, for the Committee on Rules to take legislation away from a committee with jurisdiction and report it directly to the floor. Section 34.1 of chapter 17 of Deschler's specifically grants the Committee on Rules that authority and this procedure was indeed used when Democrats were in the majority. In fact, our tally shows that 15 percent of the rules reported during the 103d Congress governed the debate on bills which had not been reported from their committee of jurisdiction.

But, I am concerned that the Republican majority has adopted this practice for the consideration of nearly

every legislative proposal that is brought to the full House. In this session, 75 percent of the bills we have voted on have not been reported from committee of jurisdiction. In other words, no votes have been taken in the committee or committees of jurisdiction on three-quarters of the bills considered by the House this session.

The Republican leadership would do well to read this small pamphlet entitled "How Our Laws Are Made." Every office has copies. They are used to send as educational materials for schools and citizens who are interested in the legislative process. The language is not hard to understand. Please let me read a pertinent passage:

Perhaps the most important phase of the congressional process is the action by committees. That is where the most intensive consideration is given to the proposed measures . . .

This short book goes on to describe committee deliberation, committee voting, the preparation of committee reports, and how that committee action and those reports are used as part of the legislative history of bills which later become laws. This book neatly sums up the accountability directly attributable to the committee process.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the direction we are heading, it seems that the Rules Committee will be the only committee in the remainder of the 104th Congress. All other committees will be irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, if that is the intention of the Republican majority, it might be necessary for the House to reprint this small pamphlet to reflect the new Republican realities.

In closing, let me say that because there is no committee report to reflect

the debate in the committee of jurisdiction, I believe it is vitally important that all sides of this issue be allowed an opportunity to speak. Consequently, it is my intention to yield time to Democrats who both support and oppose this rule and who both support and oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This is a shameful day in this House. This rule adds little glory. No hearings, no committee votes, only 1 hour of debate on one of the most important issues that will affect us. This assault weapons ban was brought to the floor faster than a Uzi's bullet.

Why? It was brought to the floor so quickly so the Nation will not see it coming.

Today Speaker GINGRICH is launching a sneak attack, and the American people are being ambushed. Seventy-five percent of all Americans do not want Uzis. They do not want AK-47's. They do not want any of these killing machines on American streets.

But we will not have a chance to debate that in full. One hour of debate on this, one of the most important issues we will grapple with? I have great respect for my colleague from New York, and I think he is a fair, fine gentleman, but this is not one of his finest hours.

No one in America is fooled by a few extra sections in the bill. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] said,

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