

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. BEILENSEN. 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 BEILENSEN, 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.

That happened in the first day, in the first day, and it is because 800,000 Federal workers are not working. What the resolution that Mr. OBEY has, that will be the pending vote before us, does is to allow them to go back to work until the December 13 and to give us some breathing room so we can work out this impasse that the Government is in.

I urge my colleagues, as strongly as I can, to defeat the rule. The bill, as others have said, is something that many can support in this body, but it does not provide us the procedure to get to the bigger crisis at hand, and that is putting back 800,000 Americans to work in this country.

So we urge defeat of the rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of complaints in the last few days that the majority of both houses have not sent the President a clean CR, a clean continuing resolution. In fact, the President himself said that the reason he was vetoing the continuing resolution was because it had extraneous material in it.

We have heard a lot of pontificating about the Congress not doing its business on time, not getting the bills done, because we are cluttering up the continuing resolutions in the interim while we try to get our appropriations bill through.

I just want to say that, as I have noted before, continuing resolutions have been the theme of the day when the Democrats controlled the House and controlled the Senate. There have been 55 continuing resolutions in the last 15 years, about 15 budget confrontations much like the one we are in today because there were differences between the President and the Congress. So all this has happened before.

But just so that we not get carried away with the thought that a clean CR has always been cherished by what is now the minority, I would point out that when they were in the majority, as far back as 1974, they appended legislation, policy, real meaningful policy legislation, to a continuing resolution that had such an impact that it changes the history, the virtual history of the United States.

I look at this document before me, which is the cover page of a continuing resolution act for 1975, dated June 30, 1974, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1975, and for other purposes.

If you go to one little obscure section, section 110 of that continuing appropriation, that CR, you find the following:

None of the funds herein made available shall be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by the United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

My friends, we ended the Vietnam war with a continuing resolution. For whatever reason whether you agree or disagree, and I think most of us would agree it was the right thing to do, it was a major policy decision that was put on a CR, a continuing resolution.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that there are Members still in this body who would have voted for that continuing resolution, that actually ended the Vietnam war using a continuing resolution?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I bet if we looked real hard, we could find a few Members who actually voted for this continuing resolution, with this significant policy statement on it, and I will bet you they are the same people, some of whom are complaining today because we did not send the President of the United States a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in other words, the gentleman really believes that some people who are now out here arguing for a clean continuing resolution actually voted for a continuing resolution that had as a policy statement the ending of the Vietnam war?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, ended it, totally. And you know how they ended it? They cut off the funding. This was not a peace treaty. This was not negotiated with the President of the United States. Congress on its own unilaterally cut off the funding of the Vietnam war in a continuing resolution.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, might there also be people in the Clinton administration that might have voted for that kind of a continuing resolution?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I dare say there are people in the White House that might have supported this.

Mr. WALKER. No, that cannot be. That cannot be.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I share the gentleman's shock and horror, but I believe that maybe, just maybe, the President of the United States himself supported cutting off the funding of the Vietnam war by virtue of the continuing resolution, and today he is concerned about us submitting policy statements on the continuing resolution. It does strike me right at the heart.

Mr. GIBBONS. . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has not been recognized. Regular order will prevail.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the theatrics and the speeches. They were very entertaining for people that probably have nothing better to do than to watch these proceedings. But the fact remains, the fact remains, boys, gentleman, Mr. Chairman, you have not done your work. The things you are sending to the President absolutely have no place on this bill. And if you want to go back to when you were elected, you were elected to change things around here. All you do is go back in the rhetoric, what happened years ago. You were elected to change things, not to come here and talk about what happened in the past.

But the fact remains, it has no business on this legislation. You have not done your work. You can show charts, you can wave your arms, you can be clever, you can have anecdotes, but the fact remains you have not done your work and you have not sent the President the appropriations bills, you just have not done the job that you were elected to do. You can rant and rave and make clever speeches, but it all boils down to the bottom line, you ain't done your work.

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, I will not take much time. I would simply try to reinforce what the gentleman from North Carolina has just said. We have heard several speakers take the floor on the Republican side of the aisle this morning and denounce business as usual. Then we hear others come to the floor and say, "Well, it is all right to do this stuff on a continuing resolution because it was done in the past." I thought you folks were bragging about the fact that you had been elected to change business as usual.

There is a very big difference between the action that was taken on the continuing resolution that ended the Vietnam war, and I was here and I voted for it and I helped draft it. I would note that the difference is that that resolution's passage saved lives, lots of them. This refusal today of this Congress to pass a continuing resolution is screwing up lives, and it is screwing up the country.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I think the gentleman is referring to my remarks earlier on this business-as-usual thing. I would simply like to clarify for the record what I meant.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DREIER. All I was trying to say when I referred to bringing business as usual to an end is that we have passed and are trying desperately to pursue a

balanced budget. Since it has been a quarter of a century since we have done that, that is really the pattern of spending we are trying to end. That is what I was referring to when I mentioned "business as usual."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I was not referring to the gentleman's comments; I was referring to the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

But I would simply say, as I said once before and I will say it again and again until the majority finally gets it, that issue is not present on this bill. That issue is not present on any of the appropriations bills, except, so far as I know, only the interrelationship between the Labor-HEW and the Defense bill.

The point is simply that what the timetable will be on the budget and what will be required in order to meet that will be determined on the reconciliation bill. But you are trying to make the President buy into ahead of time the idea that he will buy huge cuts in Medicare in order to reach your time table on a budget, and, in order to get him to do that, you are trying to hold up the ability of this House to keep the Government open, and you are trying to shift the debate from one venue to another. That is not a legitimate position for the Congress to take.

I would simply say that in the end, what happened in the past is not important. What counts is what we are going to do now to make today sensible and tomorrow better. That is what is at issue here, and that is why these bills need to pass, and that is why a clean CR needs to pass.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize what we are voting on at this time. We have got a rule before us that such distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEIL-ENSON] have said that they will support, and they have worked hard to get this bill before us. They admit that it is not a perfect bill from their vantage point; and from our vantage point it is not a perfect bill, but we are making progress.

So we have to ask ourselves at what point, if we are making progress on an appropriations bill, and there are significant Members on the other side of the aisle, a percentage of Members on the other side of the aisle that have worked hard in making it possible for this bill to come to the floor and actually will support the rule, why it is that there is an effort to defeat the rule, which is what defeating the previous question would be?

So I just want to put this in context once again. Many important issues have been brought out in this debate, but I think it is important to realize that we are talking about a rule that will be supported by many on the other

side of the aisle, as well as on this side of the aisle, to bring before us a bill that will be supported on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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 want to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and I talked yesterday afternoon about this business about it is ancient history what the Democrats have done for the last 40 years with their continuing resolutions. I went back and have done a little research. I am not going to take my full time to outline this ancient history. But because at this point, when we are talking about moving forward with a continuing resolution, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] would say "Let's not talk about what the Democrats did over the last 55 years or last 40 years or last 10 years," I think it is important to note that in 1978-79 many appropriation bills were never passed.

□ 1245

And, in fact, in 1987 and 1988, not one of the 13 appropriation bills were ever passed or ever sent to the Congress. So the Democrats will come on the House floor and give this hue and cry all about, well, we are talking about a new history with the Republican party. But we are well ahead of what you did in 1987 and 1988, where not one of the 13 appropriation bills was ever passed in Congress and sent to the President.

I can just go from 1980, 1981, 1982. The minority party's record is clear that we are way ahead of where you were. So if we want to talk about our improving, we are already at an improvement point.

I think the point my colleague should realize is that we are trying to balance the budget in 7 years. This is the whole issue. The whole defining issue is will we be able to balance the budget in 7 years, and continually the Democrats say we cut Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, today, while explaining why he vetoed a bill that would have kept the Government from shutting down, the President expressed dismay that all 13 appropriations bills had not been passed by the Congress and signed into law. Yet since 1977 the Congress failed entirely to pass all 13 appropriations bills 11 times. That's right, at least 11 times the Congress failed to pass at least one of the appropriations bills, at all.

Since 1990, the Democratic run Congress has shut down the Government nine times. The last time, in 1990, they forced President Bush to accept a compromise with them over the budget which resulted in Mr. Bush breaking his "No New Taxes" pledge. I didn't hear Mr. Panetta, then the Budget Committee chairman and now the President's Chief of Staff, claiming he was blackmailing the President.

Since 1977 the Democratic run Congress has spent the entire year on a continuing res-

olution for at least 1 of the 13 appropriations bills 11 times. In fact, for both fiscal year 1987 and 1988 the Congress failed to send even 1 of the 13 appropriations bills to the President. They spent both those years with only continuing resolutions.

Let me just list the specific instances.

In fiscal year 1978, the Labor-HEW bill was never passed. In fiscal year 1979, the energy and water bill was never passed.

In fiscal year 1980, the foreign operations, Labor-HHS, and legislative branch bills were never passed. In fiscal year 1981, the Labor-HHS, legislative branch, Commerce-Justice, and Treasury-Postal bills were never passed. In fiscal year 1982, the Commerce-Justice, Labor-HHS, legislative branch, and Treasury-Postal bills were never passed. In fiscal year 1983, the Commerce-Justice, energy and water, foreign operations, Labor-HHS, legislative branch, and Treasury-Postal bills were never passed. In fiscal year 1984, the agriculture, foreign operations, and Treasury-Postal bills were never passed. In fiscal year 1985, the Agriculture, Defense, District of Columbia, foreign operations, Interior, military construction, transportation, and Treasury-Postal bills never passed. In fiscal year 1986, the Agriculture, Defense, District of Columbia, foreign operations, Interior, Transportation, and Treasury-Postal bills were never passed. And in both fiscal years 1987 and 1988, not 1 of the 13 appropriations bills was ever passed and sent to the President.

I have heard it said that they feared to send 13 separate bills to Presidents Reagan and Bush as then the President could have vetoed only part of their budget. I was not yet privileged to serve in Congress when these actions were taken, but I know that we have no such fears and will soon send all 13 bills to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are fewer Democrats today than there were when they passed the 55 continuing resolutions, and when they acted only with continuing resolutions for an entire year 11 times, but I find it hard to believe that none of those remaining can remember the facts of what actually occurred in the past.

I hope that the President will agree to negotiate with our leadership soon, and that we can reach an agreement on this important legislation. After all, it is the veterans, seniors and other people who rely on their Government who will suffer if we don't.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], but is it not true that the Republican plan slows the growth of Medicare and does not cut Medicare? Just yes or no.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, that is not why I asked the gentleman to yield. I asked him to yield because I wanted to ask him why does his side not include the record last year?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

I would simply suggest, as I did yesterday, instead of looking at the deep, dark, distant past, why not look at last

year. Last year, I took over as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We finished all 13 appropriations bills. They were all signed by the President before the end of the fiscal year.

The reason that happened is because I went to the ranking Republican and I said let us work out a bipartisan approach to all 13 bills. It was the very first thing I did. We did, and that is why it passed. If the majority had done the same thing on these bills, they might have had the same result. But they did not, which is why 10 of them are still stuck in the muck.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if we had the Presidency, if the Republicans had the Presidency, we would pass all these, and we would not be talking about the continuing resolution or the debt ceiling.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let us talk about conditions that do exist instead of talking about fantasy conditions.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman Member of Congress. I have been here for a little over 10 months, and I have supported a balanced budget over 7 years without any tax breaks. I do not like a gun being held to my head to support a balanced budget with large tax breaks and increases in the military budget over that same 7-year period. But that is a separate debate from the debate on a continuing resolution.

This Congress has not completed its work and is using a continuing resolution to continue running the Government because it has not finished its work. To add items onto it that would be unacceptable to me and maybe other Members of their own party, let alone the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, this country is being held hostage in this process because they cannot win it on their own merits. We should have this discussion, and it should be separate and apart.

I had a veteran call my office today and want to know about their veterans benefits, and then I watched the majority colleagues conduct themselves on the floor, and I thought to myself, there are good hard-working people that are worried, that have paid their taxes, have raised their family, and if they had watched what happened on the floor of the House, regardless of party, they would be truly disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time that there is peace talks going on in the United States in regards to Bosnia and trying to bring parties together, it seems like the parties in the well of the House cannot come together in the public interest.

The President has not done anything wrong, and I resent the name calling,

indirectly, of the President of the United States. He has not done anything wrong. It is the Congress that has not completed its work by October 1, this year. Whatever happened in the past, happened in the past. Let us move forward into the future and let us do it in the public interest.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when it boils down to whether we are talking the debt ceiling, a CR, or a balanced budget, it goes to a balanced budget.

I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the President promised that he would balance the budget within 5 years. He has 2 years left on that promise. He said that it had to be scored by CBO, the only people that could really justify and certify it. Well, we had a vote on this House floor, 300 votes for a balanced budget that balances the budget in 7 years. The Senate did likewise, so both bodies, the House and the Senate, agreed, and it was CBO scored and certified in 7 years, bipartisan. Yet the President refuses to sign it knowing that we do not have enough votes in the Senate to override it.

Mr. Speaker, we have the will of the people, the will of the House, the will of the Senate, but yet the President and the lefties that control this place are advising the President not to sign it. That is what all this is about.

When we talk about appropriations bills that the minority side passed last Congress when they were in the majority, let us look at that. The gentleman says it was bipartisan. Not a single Republican voted for that tax and spend package. It cut COLA's. The highest tax in the history of the United States. They cut military COLA's. They increased tax on Social Security and they cut defense \$177 billion. We are now \$200 billion below the bottom up review in defense. In looking at Bosnia, the minority put this world at a threat.

The minority promised they would have a middle-class tax cut in that package, in that bipartisan approach, but they increased the marginal rate of the middle class and put a tax cut on them. That was bipartisan?

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we are specifically debating the rule on this bill, and the fact is that the Committee on Rules has been reasonable on this particular rule, but there is a more important, more overriding and compelling issue facing us, and it is because of this issue that we need to attach a clean continuing resolution to this bill.

Let me address some of the people who have become pawns in what has become an intense, largely political, struggle between the White House and the Congress. There were 800,000 people who were sent home yesterday, people who were told when they came into

work that they were nonessential, that they were not needed. Now, we have been assured that every one of them is going to get paid, but think about this.

The Federal taxpayer will pay out a billion dollars this week for those Federal employees to stay home from work. Is that right? Is that fair? It certainly is not what Federal employees want. What about the 1.2 million Federal employees who are working, who will get the same compensation, who will come to work every day and get paid the very same amount that their colleague down the hallway is going to get for not working?

Mr. Speaker, we should think of the situation that we have created here. Think of the disabled veteran who just came to the office which said they cannot file for his benefit that he is entitled to because that office is not open. We saw on this chart the thousands of veterans across the country who will not get their benefits; and 28,000 Social Security people who will not be able to apply for their benefits. They are all pawns in this struggle.

The reality of the situation is that this is not, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] suggested, a matter of the Democratic lefties driving us off the cliff; this is a matter of the House Republicans not being able to agree with the Senate Republicans and not getting appropriation bills to the President in time. Had the Republicans, who control the votes in both the House and Senate, been able to reach agreement any time over the last 11 months, and sent any of the 13 spending bills to the President before the end of the fiscal year, there would, quite possibly, have been no need for any continuing resolution, and certainly no need for any Government shutdown.

But the more moderate Republican Senators couldn't accept the most extreme and inappropriate riders that the House Republicans insisted on adding to all of these spending bills. That's where the responsibility must lie, and that's why we need to pass a clean continuing resolution today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let me remind the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] that he has 3 minutes remaining and is entitled to close; and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] has one-half minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], and previously the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who are, I think, very much on the mark.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will self-execute a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to

the Senate amendment and concur with an amendment that extends the continuing resolution, a clean continuing resolution, through December 13, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the amendment in the RECORD at this point.

TEXT OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT

In House Resolution 267 on page 2, line 7 strike "insist on" and insert "recede from"

On page 2, line 8 after "132" insert: "And concur therein with an amendment substituting the matter contained in section 2 of this resolution"

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC 2.

Section 106(c) of Public Law 104-31 (109 Stat. 280) is amended by striking "November 13, 1995" and inserting "December 13, 1995".

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a rule that will bring to the floor a bill that covers almost 200,000 Federal employees, and that is what we are talking about. We are talking about passing a bill today, sending it to the President, that will permit almost 200,000 Federal employees to go to work tomorrow.

In addition to that, the bill maintains a glidepath, is on a glidepath to a balanced budget in 7 years. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], was, I think, very much correct in bringing out the fact that other econometric projections, whether they are called continuing resolutions, which would not be germane to this bill, if the previous question were to fail, it would not be germane today on this rule, an econometric projection or theory that continues to pile debt is not as clean as some maintain that it is.

What we have before us in synthesis, Mr. Speaker, is a rule that will permit us to vote on a bill that is on a glidepath to a balanced budget in 7 years and that tomorrow will permit 200,000 Federal workers to go back to work.

So I would hope that the spirit of compromise that was propounded and mentioned again today on the floor by such distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEIL-ENSON] who say they will vote for the rule, will prevail, and that we will be able to pass this rule, obviously succeed on the motion for the previous question, pass the rule and then pass the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 795]

YEAS—233

Allard	Funderburk	Nethercatt
Archer	Gallegly	Neumann
Armey	Ganske	Ney
Bachus	Gekas	Norwood
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Oxley
Ballenger	Gilman	Packard
Barr	Goodlatte	Parker
Barrett (NE)	Goodling	Paxon
Bartlett	Goss	Petri
Barton	Graham	Pombo
Bass	Greenwood	Porter
Bateman	Gunderson	Portman
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pryce
Bilbray	Hancock	Quillen
Bilirakis	Hansen	Quinn
Bliley	Hastert	Radanovich
Blute	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hayes	Regula
Boehner	Hayworth	Riggs
Bonilla	Hefley	Roberts
Bono	Heineman	Rogers
Brownback	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Hillery	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burr	Hoke	Royce
Burton	Horn	Salmon
Buyer	Hostettler	Sanford
Callahan	Hunter	Saxton
Calvert	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Camp	Hyde	Schaefer
Canady	Inglis	Schiff
Castle	Istook	Seastrand
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chambless	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Jones	Shaw
Christensen	Kasich	Shays
Chrysler	Kelly	Shuster
Clinger	Kim	Skeel
Coble	King	Skelton
Coburn	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Combust	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Cox	LaHood	Solomon
Crane	Largent	Souder
Crapo	Latham	Spence
Creameans	LaTourette	Stearns
Cubin	Laughlin	Stockman
Cunningham	Lazio	Stump
Davis	Leach	Talent
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Tate
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Linder	Thomas
Doolittle	Livingston	Thornberry
Dornan	LoBiondo	Tiahrt
Dreier	Longley	Torkildsen
Duncan	Lucas	Traficant
Dunn	Manzullo	Upton
Ehlers	Martini	Visclosky
Ehrlich	McCollum	Vucanovich
Emerson	McCrery	Waldholtz
English	McDade	Walker
Ensign	McHugh	Walsh
Everett	McInnis	Wamp
Ewing	McIntosh	Watts (OK)
Fawell	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Flanagan	Metcalf	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Meyers	Weller
Forbes	Mica	Whitfield
Fowler	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fox	Molinari	Wolf
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Morella	Zeliff
Frelinghuysen	Myers	Zimmer
Frisa	Myrick	

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Andrews	Baldacci
Ackerman	Baessler	Barcia

Barrett (WI)	Green	Obey
Becerra	Gutierrez	Olver
Beilenson	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Bentsen	Hall (TX)	Orton
Berman	Hamilton	Owens
Bevill	Harman	Pallone
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bonior	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Hinchey	Pelosi
Brewster	Holden	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Poshard
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Chapman	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clay	Johnston	Reed
Clayton	Kanjorski	Richardson
Clement	Kaptur	Rivers
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Rush
Condit	Klecza	Sabo
Conyers	Klink	Sanders
Costello	LaFalce	Sawyer
Coyne	Lantos	Schroeder
Cramer	Levin	Schumer
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Scott
de la Garza	Lincoln	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dellums	Lowe	Spratt
Deutsch	Luther	Stark
Dicks	Maloney	Stenholm
Dingell	Manton	Stokes
Dixon	Markey	Studds
Doggett	Martinez	Stupak
Dooley	Mascara	Tanner
Doyle	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McCarthy	Tejeda
Edwards	McDermott	Thompson
Engel	McHale	Thornton
Eshoo	McKinney	Thurman
Evans	McNulty	Torres
Farr	Meehan	Torrice
Fattah	Meek	Towns
Fazio	Menendez	Velazquez
Filner	Mfume	Vento
Flake	Miller (CA)	Ward
Foglietta	Minge	Waters
Frank (MA)	Mink	Watt (NC)
Frost	Moakley	Waxman
Furse	Mollohan	Williams
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Wilson
Gephardt	Moran	Wise
Geren	Murtha	Woolsey
Gibbons	Nadler	Wyden
Gonzalez	Neal	Wynn
Gordon	Oberstar	Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Browder	Houghton	White
Fields (LA)	Siskiy	Young (AK)
Fields (TX)	Tucker	
Ford	Volkmer	

□ 1318

Messrs. DINGELL, BARCIA, and STUPAK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 133, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No 796]

YEAS—285

Allard Frisa Myers  
 Archer Funderburk Myrick  
 Arney Gallegly Nethercutt  
 Bachus Ganske Neumann  
 Baker (CA) Gekas Ney  
 Baker (LA) Geren Nussle  
 Ballenger Gilchrest Ortiz  
 Barr Gillmor Orton  
 Barrett (NE) Gilman Oxley  
 Barrett (WI) Goodlatte Packard  
 Bartlett Goss Parker  
 Barton Graham Paxon  
 Bass Greenwood Payne (VA)  
 Bateman Gunderson Petri  
 Beilenson Gutknecht Pombo  
 Bereuter Hall (OH) Porter  
 Berman Hall (TX) Portman  
 Beville Hamilton Poshard  
 Bilbray Hancock Pryce  
 Bilirakis Hansen Quillen  
 Bishop Hastert Quinn  
 Bliley Hastings (WA) Rahall  
 Blute Hayes Ramstad  
 Boehlert Hayworth Regula  
 Boehner Hefley Richardson  
 Bonilla Hefner Riggs  
 Bono Heineman Rivers  
 Brewster Herger Roberts  
 Browder Hilleary Roemer  
 Brown (OH) Hobson Rogers  
 Brownback Hoekstra Rohrabacher  
 Bryant (TN) Hoke Ros-Lehtinen  
 Bunn Holden Roth  
 Bunning Horn Roukema  
 Burr Hostettler Royce  
 Burton Hoyer Salmon  
 Buyer Hunter Sanford  
 Calvert Hutchinson Sawyer  
 Camp Hyde Saxton  
 Canady Inglis Scarborough  
 Cardin Jacobs Schaefer  
 Castle Johnson (CT) Schiff  
 Chabot Johnson, Sam Schiff  
 Chambliss Jones Seastrand  
 Chenoweth Kasich Sensenbrenner  
 Christensen Kelly Shadegg  
 Chrysler Kennedy (RI) Shaw  
 Clement Kennelly Shays  
 Clinger Kildee Shuster  
 Coble Kim Sisisky  
 Coburn King Skaggs  
 Collins (GA) Kingston Skeen  
 Combest Kleczka Skelton  
 Condit Klug Smith (MI)  
 Cooley Knollenberg Smith (NJ)  
 Costello Kolbe Smith (TX)  
 Cox LaHood Smith (WA)  
 Cramer Largent Solomon  
 Crane Latham Souder  
 Crapo LaTourette Spence  
 Cremeans Laughlin Stearns  
 Cubin Lazio Stenholm  
 Cunningham Leach Stockman  
 Davis Levin Studts  
 Deal Lewis (CA) Stump  
 DeLay Lewis (KY) Stupak  
 Diaz-Balart Lightfoot Talent  
 Dickey Lincoln Tate  
 Dicks Linder Tauzin  
 Dingell Lipinski Taylor (NC)  
 Dixon Livingston Thomas  
 Dooley LoBiondo Thornberry  
 Doolittle Longley Thornton  
 Dornan Lucas Tiahrt  
 Dreier Luther Turkildsen  
 Duncan Manzullo Traficant  
 Dunn Martini Upton  
 Ehlers McCarthy Visclosky  
 Ehrlich McCollum Vucanovich  
 Emerson McCrery Waldholtz  
 English McDade Walker  
 Ensign McHugh Walsh  
 Eshoo McClinnis Wamp  
 Everett McKeon Ward  
 Ewing Metcalf Watts (OK)  
 Farr Meyers Weldon (FL)  
 Fawell Mica Weldon (PA)  
 Flanagan Miller (FL) Weller  
 Foley Moakley Whitfield  
 Forbes Molinari Wicker  
 Fowler Montgomerly Wise  
 Fox Moorhead Wolf  
 Franks (CT) Moran Young (FL)  
 Franks (NJ) Morella Zeliff  
 Frelinghuysen Murtha Zimmer

NAYS—133

Abercrombie Gibbons Oberstar  
 Ackerman Gonzalez Obey  
 Andrews Gordon Olver  
 Baesler Green Owens  
 Baldacci Gutierrez Pallone  
 Becerra Harman Pastor  
 Ney Hastings (FL) Payne (NJ)  
 Bonior Hilliard Peterson (FL)  
 Borski Hinchey Peterson (MN)  
 Boucher Istook Pickett  
 Brown (CA) Jackson-Lee Pomeroy  
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Rangel  
 Bryant (TX) Johnson (SD) Reed  
 Chapman Johnson, E. B. Rose  
 Clay Johnston Roybal-Allard  
 Clayton Kanjorski Rush  
 Clyburn Kaptur Sabo  
 Coleman Kennedy (MA) Sanders  
 Collins (IL) Klink Schroeder  
 Collins (MI) LaFalce Schumer  
 Conyers Lantos Scott  
 Coyne Lewis (GA) Serrano  
 Danner Lofgren Spratt  
 de la Garza Lowey Stark  
 DeFazio Maloney Stokes  
 DeLauro Manton Tanner  
 Dellums Markey Taylor (MS)  
 Deutsch Martinez Tejada  
 Doggett Rivers Mascara  
 Doyle Matsui Torres  
 Durbin McDermott Torricelli  
 Edwards McHale Towns  
 Engel McIntosh Velazquez  
 Evans McKinney Vento  
 Fattah McNulty Waters  
 Fazio Meehan Watt (NC)  
 Filner Meek Waxman  
 Flake Menendez Williams  
 Foglietta Mfume Wilson  
 Ford Miller (CA) Woolsey  
 Frank (MA) Minge Wyden  
 Frost Mink Wynn  
 Furse Mollohan Yates  
 Gejdenson Nadler  
 Gephardt Neal

NOT VOTING—14

Barcia Houghton Tucker  
 Callahan Norwood Volkmer  
 Fields (LA) Pelosi White  
 Fields (TX) Radanovich Young (AK)  
 Goodling Slaughter

□ 1327

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.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2020, and that I may include tabular and extra-neous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2020,  
 TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE,  
 AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AP-  
 PROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 267, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 25, 1995, at page H10813.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring to the House today the conference report on H.R. 2020, fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of Treasury, the Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and other independent agencies.

For discretionary programs under our control, the conference report is below the subcommittee's section 602(b) allocation by \$67 million in outlays, below last year's spending by \$646 million, below the President's request by \$1.2 billion, and below the level passed by the House on July 19 by \$243 million. With only 5 exceptions, every account in this appropriations bill is below last year's level. I think that this is another step toward a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, as we have waited for the conferees to come to a resolution on the Istook-Simpson amendment, I have sensed an attitude of indifference on the part of many of my colleagues about the need to send this bill to the President quickly and in a form that he can readily sign.

Granted, this bill does not have a strong constituency. Mr. Speaker, I tell you this about the Treasury appropriations bill. It is not a throwaway piece of legislation.

This bill funds the nuts and bolts of Government for the General Services Administration, maintaining our Federal buildings and courthouses. It protects the integrity of our Nation's currency through the anticounterfeiting efforts of the Secret Service. It preserves our Nation's history through the National Archives. It provides for the protection of our President and other dignitaries. It funds programs that ensure our trade laws are properly enforced, that drugs are interdicted along our borders, and that our tax laws are implemented.

Let there be no mistake about it. The programs funded here do touch the lives of each and every American.

Yesterday the Government shut down, including the programs funded in this appropriations measure. Without