

Ballenger	Goodlatte	Neumann
Barcia	Goss	Ney
Barr	Graham	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Nussle
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Oberstar
Barton	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Orton
Bereuter	Hancock	Oxley
Bevill	Hansen	Packard
Bilirakis	Hastert	Parker
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Blute	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Boehner	Hayworth	Petri
Bonilla	Hefley	Pombo
Bonior	Heineman	Portman
Bono	Herger	Poshard
Borski	Hilleary	Quillen
Brewster	Hoekstra	Quinn
Browder	Hoke	Radanovich
Brownback	Holden	Rahall
Bryant (TN)	Hostettler	Regula
Bunn	Hunter	Riggs
Bunning	Hutchinson	Roberts
Burr	Hyde	Roemer
Burton	Inglis	Rogers
Buyer	Istook	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Camp	Jones	Royce
Canady	Kanjorski	Salmon
Chabot	Kasich	Sanford
Chambliss	Kildee	Saxton
Chenoweth	Kim	Scarborough
Christensen	King	Schaefer
Clinger	Kingston	Seastrand
Coble	Klecza	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Klink	Shadegg
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Shaw
Combest	LaFalce	Shuster
Cooley	LaHood	Skeen
Costello	Largent	Skelton
Cox	Latham	Smith (MI)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Laughlin	Smith (TX)
Cremeans	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Souder
Danner	Linder	Spence
de la Garza	Lipinski	Stearns
Deal	Livingston	Stenholm
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	Longley	Stump
Dickey	Lucas	Stupak
Doolittle	Manton	Talent
Doyle	Manzullo	Tanner
Dreier	Mascara	Tate
Duncan	McCollum	Tauzin
Dunn	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Ehlers	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McHugh	Tejeda
English	McInnis	Thornberry
Ensign	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Everett	McKeon	Trafficant
Ewing	McNulty	Vucanovich
Fields (TX)	Metcalfe	Waldholtz
Flanagan	Mica	Walker
Foley	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Forbes	Moakley	Wamp
Fowler	Molinari	Watts (OK)
Fox	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Frisa	Montgomery	Weldon (PA)
Funderburk	Moorhead	Weller
Galleghy	Murtha	Whitfield
Ganske	Myers	Wicker
Gekas	Myrick	Wolf
Geren	Neal	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Nethercutt	Zeliff

## NAYS—183

Abercrombie	Chapman	Doggett
Ackerman	Clay	Dooley
Andrews	Clayton	Durbin
Baesler	Clement	Edwards
Baldacci	Clyburn	Ehrlich
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	Engel
Bass	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Evans
Beilenson	Condit	Farr
Bentsen	Conyers	Fattah
Berman	Coyne	Fawell
Bilbray	Cramer	Fazio
Bishop	Davis	Filner
Boehlert	DeFazio	Flake
Boucher	DeLauro	Foglietta
Brown (FL)	Dellums	Ford
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Frank (MA)
Bryant (TX)	Dicks	Franks (CT)
Cardin	Dingell	Franks (NJ)
Castle	Dixon	Frelinghuysen

Frost	Maloney	Sabo
Furse	Markey	Sanders
Gejdenson	Martinez	Sawyer
Gephardt	Martini	Schiff
Gibbons	Matsui	Schroeder
Gilchrest	McCarthy	Schumer
Gilman	McDermott	Scott
Gonzalez	McHale	Serrano
Gordon	McKinney	Shays
Green	Meehan	Sisisky
Greenwood	Meek	Skaggs
Gutierrez	Menendez	Slaughter
Hamilton	Meyers	Spratt
Harman	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Minge	Stokes
Hefner	Mink	Studds
Hilliard	Moran	Thomas
Hinchey	Morella	Thompson
Hobson	Nadler	Thornton
Horn	Obey	Thurman
Hoyer	Olver	Torkildsen
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Torres
Jefferson	Pallone	Torricelli
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Towns
Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)	Upton
Johnson, E.B.	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
Johnston	Pelosi	Vento
Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Pickett	Ward
Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy	Waters
Kennelly	Porter	Watt (NC)
Klug	Pryce	Waxman
Kolbe	Ramstad	White
Lazio	Rangel	Williams
Leach	Reed	Wilson
Levin	Richardson	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Woolsey
Lincoln	Rose	Wyden
Lofgren	Roukema	Wynn
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Yates
Luther	Rush	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—12

Brown (CA)	Goodling	Mfume
Chrysler	Houghton	Tucker
Dornan	Kaptur	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Lantos	Young (AK)

□ 1144

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

Mr. FOGLIETTA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 794, the Callahan motion to disagree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 115 on the foreign assistance appropriations conference report, I am not recorded. I was in conference with the majority leader of the Senate at that time and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1145

# WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 267 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 267

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. If the conference report is adopted, then a motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132 shall be considered as adopted.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 267 is a rule waiving points of order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. H.R. 2020 provides funds for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies.

The rule waives points of order against the conference agreement and its consideration. In addition, the rule disposes of the amendment in disagreement by including a provision which considers the House's insistence on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, numbered 132, as adopted with the conference report's adoption. In other words, to demonstrate the resolve of the House, the rule self-executes out the amendment in disagreement so that the conference report can be passed expeditiously by both Chambers and sent to the President without further delay.

The amendment in disagreement concerned language prohibiting the use of funds for political advocacy by certain Federal grant recipients, and the conferees were unable to decide on advocacy language between Senator SIMPSON's version and Congressman ISTOOK's proposed compromise. The President has indicated that a veto would be likely if this political advocacy language were to be included with the Treasury, Postal bill, and, in a spirit of compromise and in order to get this bill signed as soon as possible, without risking another trip back from the Senate in the interim, this lone amendment in disagreement is disposed of in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on H.R. 2020 provides \$11.6 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 1996, which is \$646 million less than the fiscal year 1995 level. Thus, this bill saves money and keeps us on a glidepath to a balanced budget in 7 years. There has been some bipartisan cooperation in getting this bill to the

floor today, and it is responsible legislation. More importantly, it covers 192,000 Federal employees, which is a full 10 percent of the total Federal work force. By adopting this rule and the conference report today, we will be one step closer to completing the appropriations process and we will be resolving the critical problem of a substantial portion of the Federal work force.

I would like to commend subcommittee Chairman LIGHTFOOT, Chairman LIVINGSTON, subcommittee ranking member HOYER, and full committee ranking member OBEY for their hard work on this bill. I urge adoption of this rule.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for yielding the customary 30 minutes of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations conference report. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, which is necessary to expedite the consideration of this appropriations conference report.

We do not oppose these waivers, but we do take this opportunity to point out that we on this side of the aisle, when we were in the majority, were often roundly criticized for recommending such blanket waivers of our standing rules. We hope our Republican colleagues now understand that such waivers are often necessary for the expeditious and timely consideration of legislation.

The rule also provides that, if the conference report is adopted, the controversial Istook amendment will be dropped. We support the removal of the Istook language that would severely restrict the ability of organizations that receive any Federal assistance from using their own non-Federal money for lobbying or political advocacy.

This conference report has been delayed for weeks because of this very controversial rider, which did not belong on an appropriations bill.

Further, the President has indicated that he will sign this appropriations bill if it does not contain the Istook language.

In the Rules Committee last night, the Democrats offered an amendment that would have modified the rule to allow for a motion to dispose of Senate amendment No. 132 and replace it with a clean continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government running through December 13. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated on a party-line vote.

We will be asking Members to defeat the previous question on this resolution so that we may again attempt to offer this motion to keep the Federal Government running for another

month while we work to pass the nine remaining appropriations bills.

The Federal Government has already been shut down for 2 days, causing confusion and hardship for those who rely on the services of the Federal Government. Although so-called essential personnel remain on the job, tens of thousands of vital workers are not at their posts. We ought to stop playing this game that affects the lives of Federal employees, and of citizens who need the services of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal concerns about this bill is the serious under-funding of the Internal Revenue Service, particularly in the area of enforcement. The level was low in the House-passed bill, and the Senate lowered it even further. Adequate funding for enforcement would have resulted in more funds being collected for the treasury. Now, it is likely that this cut will actually add to the deficit. Unfortunately, because of the extremely low Senate 602(b) allocation, there is no way to fix this shortfall at this time.

Many of us are deeply disappointed that the conference agreement reverses current policy by banning, with certain exceptions, the use of funds in the bill to pay for abortions under Federal employee health benefit plans.

The reinstatement of the policy that we overturned in 1993, threatens the right of Federal employees to choose to have an abortion—a right that has been guaranteed by the Supreme Court and discriminates against women in public service.

I regret that we are taking one more step against ensuring all women the right to a safe and legal abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we are already 6 weeks into the new fiscal year, and only three of the 13 regular appropriations bills have been enacted into law. Our Government has been forced to shut down and send most Federal employees home.

Although this conference report for the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill is not all that we might want it to be, it appears to have the support it needs to be passed, and it will apparently be signed by the President when we send it to him.

Almost 200,000 Federal employees are affected by this legislation, nearly 10 percent of the Federal work force. Almost 95,000 of those workers were sent home yesterday due to the Government shutdown. If we pass this appropriations bill, we can put those people back to work.

We urge the House to complete action on this bill, so we can send it to the Senate and then to the White House.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

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

□ 1200

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. As has been noted by the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from California, it is important that we move forward with this piece of legislation, which affects roughly 190,000 Federal employees, and which will allow them an opportunity to get back to work and an opportunity to move forward toward the successful conclusion of all of our appropriations packages.

As has been outlined by previous speakers, one of the big hangups was what has become known as the Istook amendment. It has been explained that it is now being pursued or will be pursued on other pieces of legislation. That is not to say that the leadership on this side of the aisle as in any way weakened in their support for what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] is attempting to accomplish, but there comes a time to make some decisions. A decision was made that this is an issue that best would be pursued in another venue, perhaps on lobbying reform or on another appropriations bill.

I would state to those who support the Istook amendment that there is strong support for it, but it will be pursued in another vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, by passing it, does take that particular amendment out of this package. We will of course discuss the bill in further detail later, but I think there is a great deal of work that has gone into it.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the ranking member, and I worked together on this for about 11 months. The committee staff has worked endless hours on 141 differences between the House, the Senate, and the White House which have been resolved. Overall it makes a few people happy, it makes a few people mad, so it is probably a pretty good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, now's our chance, now's our chance to vote for a clean continuing resolution.

Now's our chance to stop playing politics and put 650,000 Federal employees back to work.

Congress has one primary obligation, and that is to pass the 13 appropriations bills before October 1. Obviously October 1 has passed, but we can still get it done. I would ask my Republican

colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to stop playing games.

If my Republican colleagues had done their work we wouldn't need a continuing resolution. But Democrats are willing to support a clean continuing resolution, not one loaded down with Medicare premium increases and education cuts that we know President Clinton won't sign. I ask my colleagues to accept our offer of a bipartisan solution.

After the debate on this rule we will offer a clean continuing resolution no Medicare premium increases, no education cuts, no fiddling with people's jobs. No putting politics before the business of running the country. A simple extension so Congress can get its job done.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to rise above the partisan squabbling and get the Government running again.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I support this rule.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding and I think misrepresentation about Medicare. Medicare is going to increase the benefits by \$1,900 over the next few years. The percentage of growth is going to be 6.5 percent, which is above most private health plans. So senior citizens need to know that their benefits are going to increase, an they are going to have to pay, according to the plan we have, 31 percent of the premium, but 69 percent is going to be paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about another aspect of this that I think is important to my colleagues. This morning on Business Day, on CNN, they had a financial expert on there that predicted, if we stick to our guns and we get to a balanced budget in 7 years, that interest rates on home mortgages will drop down to between 5 and 5.5 percent, which will be the lowest interest rate on home mortgages since the 1950's. Likewise, interest rates on short-term financial transactions like car loans will drop dramatically.

What that means to the average taxpayer is more money in their pocket. They will be able to afford cars that they cannot now afford, because they will be able to afford the payments because of the lower interest rates. They will be able to buy homes which will be a boon to the housing industry and to economic expansion.

So this balanced budget that we are going to see in 7 years, if we stick to our guns, and we intend to do that, is going to be beneficial to everybody in the country who buys anything, because interest rates are going to drop and they are going to drop precipitously, according to most economic experts.

Now, in addition to that, we are talking about tax cuts for average families,

a \$500 per child tax cut for the families that have children. We are talking about a capital gains tax that is going to benefit probably 75 percent of the people in this country regarding capital gains.

So this package that we have talked about, this balanced budget approach, will result in lower home interest rates, lower car interest rates, lower interest rates on small loans. It will translate into lower taxes for the average family and lower taxes for the business people. It is going to be good for the entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the senior citizens, I am very disappointed that my colleagues keep beating on this issue and trying to frighten them. We all know that the Medicare trust fund is going to go bankrupt if we do not do something about it. We are doing something about it. We are going to solve the problem.

There is going to be a 31-percent cost to the senior citizen, but 69 percent is going to be paid for by the taxpayer, and they are still going to have their benefits go up to 6.5 percent a year, which means they are going to have a \$1,900 increase in benefits over the next 5 to 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good package, it is good for America, and I hope my colleagues will reconsider supporting it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

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

Mr. Speaker, in response to the comments that were just made, this issue that is before us today is about the appropriations process and moving that forward.

The gentleman speaks about the balanced budget. I am one of those who voted for the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. I am one who voted for the Stenholm budget as an alternative which balances the budget in 7 years. I am one who voted for the coalition budget, which balances the budget in 7 years.

Frankly, in reference to the gentleman from Indiana who mentioned senior citizens, from my perspective, having voted for all of those, taking a \$245 billion tax cut and taking a big whack out of senior citizens, \$270 billion in Medicare, is not needed. The trustees do not think it is needed and I do not think it is needed.

Having said that, that is not what this is about. This is about what we have been saying would preclude the shutdown of Government. That is, the accomplishment, in the regular order, of the appropriations process. That is why I am going to support this rule. However, I want to say that I very much regret that the Committee on Rules failed to allow the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on

Appropriations [Mr. OBEY] to offer a clean continuing resolution as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, whether we use the figure of 650,000 or 800,000, there are an awful lot of people that were sent home yesterday and are not doing the job today that the American public expects them to do.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, has repeatedly tried to bring such a bill to the floor in recent days and has been blocked at every opportunity, frankly, by Speaker GINGRICH and others. Today, Federal workers are at home furloughed for just one reason: We have not gotten our work done.

Mr. Speaker, 53 percent of the employees of the Department of Treasury covered by this bill, about 83,000 men and women, are at home today because of the Government shutdown and frankly the inability of Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership to resolve the issue that is now resolved in this rule. Fifty percent of the employees of the Office of Personnel Management and 79 percent of the workers of the General Services Administration are at home today, not doing the job that the American public expects of them.

So while I am glad the rule allows this bill to finally move forward, I believe the real business of the House today should be passing a continuing resolution and an extension of the debt limit ceiling without extraneous riders.

We drop an extraneous rider in this rule. I believe that is wise policy. We can consider that issue on some other legislation. Passage of this bill, however, which I believe the President will sign, will put important Government agencies back to work. It will also put about 90,000 furloughed civil servants, some obviously from my congressional district, but I suggest to you from congressional districts all over the United States, back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore my intention, as I said earlier, to support the rule. I am pleased that the committee rejected, as I requested, the latest attempt to add the Istook-Ehrlich language to gag nonprofit organizations to this bill. That issue alone, not any of the other issues in this bill, that issue alone, an extraneous, unrelated-to-the-appropriations-process issue, has held this bill hostage for 63 days.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the chairman of the subcommittee, got the conference organized, got this bill agreed upon in conference, did his work. I do not agree with everything in this bill, as I have told the Committee on Rules and as I will say later in the debate on this floor. The gentleman from Iowa does not agree with everything in this bill. But the legislative process, as has been said, is a process of compromise. It is a process of being reasonable. That is what the American public expects us to do.

Therefore, I am going to support this rule because it does move forward a bill

that although not perfect, is, in my opinion, probably as good as our side is going to get in terms of this legislative process, and the realities on this floor and in the Senate.

The Istook issue, which I mentioned earlier, has stalled consideration of this bill too long. I commend the other side for finally dropping it from this piece of legislation. There are many problems, as I have said, with this measure which I will detail during the general debate.

Constraints of the 602(b) allocation, however, put a lot of pressure on the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and the committee to work within those constraints. I understand that. Within those constraints, this is, in my opinion, an acceptable piece of legislation.

I certainly share the concern that we should be passing a clean continuing resolution, as I said earlier, so we can get the whole Government back to work. It would be very simple to do that, Mr. Speaker. We could have a unanimous-consent request and pass, as we did under President Reagan and President Bush and now under President Clinton, a clean continuing resolution. Recognizing that we have not done our work here in Congress, have not passed those 10 appropriations bills so that the President could sign them and keep Government operating at such levels as we agree upon, then, Mr. Speaker, I think we would be doing our work responsibly.

A clean CR is a responsible act to take. I hope that at some time during this process the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be successful in bringing up and seeing passed a clean continuing resolution, and I will support that, and I will support efforts on this bill and others to accomplish that objective. But in the final analysis, I believe this bill does, in fact, warrant our support as moving the appropriations process forward in a responsible way.

□ 1215

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, engaged in attempting to get our work done, and this is rather interesting, to hear people that now have differing versions of getting the work done.

The best way to reopen offices in the Government is to send bills to the White House, have the White House sign them into law on a permanent basis, so that we do not even have to deal with continuing resolutions or other kinds of mechanisms.

Yet now what we are hearing from the other side is that they are satisfied to have us do continuing resolutions as long as it is on their terms. They love this term of a clean continuing resolution.

In our view, what we are attempting to do here with the legislation that we are moving through the process in terms of regular appropriations, and what we have done on continuing resolutions and on the balanced budget bills, is we are attempting to put a down payment on the balanced budget for the American people. That is what this debate is all about, whether or not we are going to balance the budget in 7 years.

If, in fact, what we do is do a so-called clean CR, or a clean debt limit, clean CR's and clean debt limits are a dirty deal. They are a dirty deal for future generations, they are a dirty deal for older Americans, and they are a dirty deal for the American middle class.

So each time that we hear the opposition say that they are for a clean CR, it is a clean political product that gives them the opportunity to go on spending at past years' rates, that gets us nowhere near to a balanced budget. In fact, if we listen to what is really happening here, the fact is that all of those continuing appropriations in past years are \$200 billion deficits into infinity.

We are no longer going to allow that to happen. We have decided that we are going to begin, with everything we do from now on in, to make a down payment on a balanced budget, and we are going to pass appropriation bills that give us a balanced budget for real. We are going to move in the direction of a balanced budget.

No more excuses, no more gimmicks, no more phony figures, no more claims that, oh, we will do it some time in the future. We are going to begin to do it right now. Anything other than that is a dirty deal, because it means that future generations are going to have to pay more and more of the bill for what we do now. It means that the elderly are going to more and more have their pension funds raided by the Secretary of the Treasury, and it means that middle-class Americans are not going to get the take-home pay and the tax cuts that they deserve at the present time.

We need the down payment now. When we have a vote to defeat the previous question here, it is not a vote about a clean CR. It is a vote about a dirty deal for future generations.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker is just plain wrong. This debate on this bill is not about the deficit. This debate is about whether or not the President of the United States, some 800,000 workers, and the entire country will be held hostage to the demand by Speaker GINGRICH and others on his team that the President buy into a budget concept and timetable that will require huge reductions in fu-

ture Medicare payments by this Government and a doubling of Medicare premiums. That is what is going on here.

That debate about what happens to Medicare and that debate about the shape and nature of the path to a balanced budget is supposed to occur on the reconciliation bill which is now in conference between the House and the Senate. That is a multiyear fight. That is a multiyear bill. But that bill has not yet even gone to the President, so the President is not even in a position to determine whether he would sign it or veto it, because we still do not know what the final contents of that will be.

Meanwhile, what we have before us is the fact that we still have ten 1-year appropriation bills which have not made their way to the White House. The President cannot rationally be criticized for not signing something that has not yet been sent to him.

What we have at issue now, today, is whether the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1 of the 10 remaining unsigned bills because it has not yet gotten to the President, whether that bill ought to be moved forward. We think it should.

We have a significant disagreement with the majority party on their underfunding of the IRS, because ironically while the gentleman from Pennsylvania says he is concerned about getting the deficit down, the underfunding of the IRS is actually going to add to the deficit next year, because we will not be collecting revenues that are due the Government.

But despite that difference, we are willing to support the basic thrust of this bill. Most of us on this side of the aisle will vote for this bill when we get to the question of final passage.

But what we are suggesting is this: We are suggesting that this bill only allows 100,000 workers to go back to work if it is signed by the President, and what we are suggesting is that all 800,000 workers who are out of work ought to be able to go back. The fastest way to accomplish that is to turn down the previous question, turn down the rule, and allow me to offer this amendment to the resolution before us.

This resolution will simply say that when this bill passes and when it is signed by the President, that the other operations of Government are continued until December 13, 1995. That is all we are trying to do.

We have, at this moment as I speak, some 125 cosponsors to this proposition, and by the end of the day we are going to have a whole lot more than that.

We had every single Democrat vote yesterday plus three Republicans who voted yesterday to try to extend the continuation of the Government action so that we do not continue this silly spectacle of the Government being shut down while we are trying to pass our annual appropriation bills.

Do not be confused. Do not be fooled. This issue is not about whether there is

going to be a 7-year deficit path to zero or not. This is a fight about whether or not the Government is going to do its basic business, whether the services that people have a right to expect from the Government are going to be provided, whether Social Security recipients are going to get their questions answered, whether veterans are going to be able to get their questions answered.

I understand that one State announced yesterday they may have to cancel a portion of their hunting season because their national forests will not be open because of the shutdown of the agencies involved. That may not be very important to some people on this floor but it is awfully important to an awful lot of hunters in this country. The list of services goes on and on.

I would suggest what is at issue is not the content of this bill. What is at issue is whether or not we are going to meet our responsibilities to keep the Government open without engaging in blackmail using many thousand American citizens as hostages.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and congratulating him on his fine management of this very important rule.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are unhappy with the fact that we are faced with a shutdown of the Federal Government. I am one of those who is very, very concerned.

But having said that, I am convinced that the people whom I am privileged to represent and others from around the country are even more concerned about the prospect of proceeding down the road of business as usual. That is the main reason that we have gotten to the point where we are today.

There is a sense from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that defeating the previous question will somehow allow them to offer this resolution that would provide a clean CR. Well, it is not germane and could not be considered even if the previous question is defeated.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I think the gentleman would have to admit that we would be in a position to offer it if no Member on his side of the aisle raised a parliamentary objection.

Mr. DREIER. It is nongermane to the bill and it could not be brought up. Now, what my friend advocated was defeat of the previous question and defeat of the rule. Obviously if they proceeded with a completely different rule.

But under this rule, the standing rules of the House, it would be non-

germane and I think that is what needs to be realized as we proceed with this.

So let me just say that I am convinced that we—

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman mind answering my question?

Mr. DREIER. The answer is, It is nongermane to this measure. I thank my friend for the question.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that as we look at where we are headed today, I hope very much that we can put into place a package that will balance the budget.

I was rather struck with the statement that came from the President yesterday. I did not see it but a couple of the essential members of my staff saw it and they were rather struck. They indicated to me that apparently a land speed record was broken, because in 3 minutes, the President on 11 occasions talked about his quest for a balanced budget.

He said:

We share a central goal, balancing the federal budget.

We must balance the budget.

I proposed to Congress a balanced budget.

We must balance the budget.

I proposed my balanced budget plan.

It balances the budget.

We can balance the budget.

We can balance the budget.

I am fighting for a balanced budget.

I'll balance the budget.

I will continue to fight for the right kind of balanced budget.

Looking at those statements that were made by the President, one could not help but think once again of what David Broder referred to in his very famous column back in 1993 as the "trust deficit." The trust deficit is something that many people have talked about since then. In that piece that Broder wrote, he said in the 1992 campaign that President Clinton played fast and loose with the facts.

The President knows that people are unhappy about the fact that the Federal Government has shut down and that we are at this point, but he also knows that the American people want us to balance the budget.

This is really little more than what the New York Times described as a political play, and I believe that it is not contributing to our ultimate goals of trying to bring about a modicum of fiscal responsibility.

We also know that Robert Samuelson, another very respected columnist, has written several damning pieces about the President, and I do not like to be one who in any way is critical of the President of the United States, but in this piece he is very direct and blunt, more blunt than I would be, frankly, when he just said, "Clinton lies." That is the way he put it.

So these things came to mind as we observe the rhetoric that has been going on for such a long period of time, and then these 11 claims to be pursuing a balanced budget. It is very unfortunate. I hope very much that we will be able to settle this thing, but it is not going to be done by defeating the pre-

vious question on this. The responsible thing for us to do is to pass this rule and proceed with the appropriations bills, which is what we very much want to do. I hope my colleagues will join in doing that.

□ 1230

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member should not make such personal references to the President of the United States.

Mr. DREIER. I was quoting, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It makes no difference whether it was quoted or not quoted.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], our distinguished whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my dear friend, TONY BEILENSON, for allowing me this time.

Let me just say at the outset I want to commend the Committee on Rules for the work they did on this particular rule. Let me also echo the points that were made by my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The issue that we face here on the impending votes which will occur in the next few minutes on the rule itself is whether or not we want to allow the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to offer a resolution in which he has over 135 Members sponsoring and will probably have over 200 by the end of the day; to allow him to offer that motion which will extend the Government and put all 800,000 workers back to work until we can reach a resolution to this budget impasse; or whether or not we will be satisfied with just putting 100,000 of these Federal workers back to work.

The date I believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin will extend this to is December 13. It seems to us if we are serious about dealing with this crisis, that, as this chart shows, affects over 1,161,000 Americans: 28,000 American seniors and workers who have been unable to apply for Social Security or disability benefits; 200,000 American seniors who have tried to call the 1-800-HELP line for Social Security and got no answer. This has happened the first day of the crisis we are in. Over 7,000 American veterans have been unable to file compensation benefits and education benefit claims or adjustments; 781,000 people have been turned away from the national parks and monuments; 99,000 tourists have been shut out of the Smithsonian museums and the National Zoo, the Kennedy Center, the Gallery of Art. It goes on and on: 45,000 Americans have not been able to get passports to visit loved ones who may be sick or dying overseas; 700 recruits have been unable to enlist in our Nation's Armed Forces.