

with both the Senate and the President, it is important that the House be able to act immediately on the floor to consider any rule that deals with providing funds for the urgent matter of expired appropriations. I urge adoption of House Resolution 265.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we do not object to this rule. We think it is reasonable, as we did in the past when our Republican colleagues supported our requests to waive the two-thirds vote requirement. Of course, we should not even be in a position of debating it tonight. The only reason it is necessary for us to do so is that the Republican controlled Congress has been unable to do its most basic job, and that is to pass appropriations bills. That is why we are here considering this waiver of a standing rule of the House.

The public is wondering what we are doing, as they should. The arguments we will be considering in the context of the next resolution over such a controversial provision as how to reach a balanced budget should be taking place in the context of the budget reconciliation bill, legislation which the House and Senate have in fact already passed.

There is no need to encumber the continuing resolution with this extraneous provision which will be considered where it should be, in the conference report on budget reconciliation, which should be before us on Friday.

We ought to do now what we could have done last week, pass a continuing appropriations measure that is clean and straightforward. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, has attempted several times to gain unanimous consent to bring his legislation to the floor for that purpose but unfortunately has repeatedly been denied that request.

We repeat, we Democrats remain willing and ready to expedite in a reasonable and responsible manner the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

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

Time is of the essence with this. Federal workers have been sitting home the last couple of days. They want to resume their jobs. They want to continue on with governing, which is what this is all about. For Members who believe we should get our Government back up and operating, this rule makes sense. This is urgent legislation, as my colleague noted earlier in his remarks. This is one of the few times we would

waive this rule, but I think that we can get a bipartisan yes to this rule and hopefully to the resolution that will follow.

As I said before, Federal employees want to return to work. They are eager to get on with their business. Many employees, even if they are with funded agencies at this point or are deemed essential employees under the law, are still unable in many cases to perform their work because of other limitations in procurement and hiring and firing that take place because we do not have continuing resolutions in effect. So, should the rule come forward and this resolution be passed and sent to the President, all of this will be resolved should the President sign it.

I think the subsequent resolution is something that the President should sign. The continuing resolution will make sense for several reasons. First of all, the funding levels contained here are adequate for the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government to continue for the next 18 days. There is no dip in the funding that will cut education, that will cut the environmental programs for 18 days and that should hinder that. It is certainly better than what we are being funded today.

Second, it will get our Federal employees back working tomorrow. Third, it strips the Medicare and other riders that the President and the administration have deemed superfluous and have said are unacceptable. We have taken those out.

Finally, it mutually, mutually commits the Congress, both the House and the Senate, and the President to balance the Federal budget with CBO numbers over the next 7 years. This should be no problem for this Congress or Members of both sides of the aisle who have professed to stand for this and for the President who on numerous occasions has said he is for a balanced budget and accepts CBO numbers.

I rise in support of this rule and the subsequent resolution.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 122, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-343) on the resolution (H. Res. 270) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 122, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 270 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 270

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit without or without instructions. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], 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. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House without intervening points of order of the joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996 through December 5, 1995. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and further provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 2000

The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is not the legislation that will bring us a balanced budget in 7 years. However, the political confrontation that has preoccupied this city and the national media, if not all Americans for the last few days, has been about one simple, but fundamental issue—balancing the budget.

The continuing resolution we will consider this evening will fund the Government for 20 days. Taken alone,

that may not seem like much. However, it is extremely significant because it will give Congress and the President more time to pass the regular spending bills, and a balanced budget reconciliation bill, to get the Government on a realistic glidepath to a balanced budget.

Frankly Mr. Speaker, it is taking us more time than we would like to pass those appropriations bills. We have run this House in a much more open manner than it was operated under the old majority. There have been more amendments and more open rules. The open process delayed the House. The result has been that we have worked more days and cast more votes than past Congresses. Along with the other body carrying out its constitutional role of slowing down the legislative process, it is simply harder to craft appropriations bills when you are operating within the constraints of a balanced budget. You can not just throw money at every problem.

As those who served on the other side of the aisle for many terms as members of the old majority certainly know, past Congresses often used continuing resolutions to provide spending authority in lieu of regular appropriations bills. For example, in 1987 and 1988, all of the appropriations bills were wrapped up in a year-long continuing resolutions. In addition, legislative add-ons were a common occurrence.

The administration precipitated this confrontation for political reasons. They looked at polls and saw that picking a fight over Medicare, even if there really were no Medicare reductions in the bill, was good for the President. Even the New York Times called the administration's Medicare charges purely political. The administration placed a Medicare attack strategy ahead of a balanced budget work strategy.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has called for a higher rate of spending for programs that were eliminated in the House and Senate appropriations bill. While a clean continuing resolution would not normally provide funding when the House and Senate both voted to eliminate the program, the original bill did provide 60 percent funding in the spirit of compromise. Calls for higher funding belie the true intention to simply continue with the status quo rather than have a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the overriding issue is whether we will have a balanced budget. This Congress was charged by the American people in an historical election to balance the Federal budget and restore the future for America's children. That is hard work as we found out. We can do it in 7 years, while letting programs like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, school lunches and student loans grow—just not as fast as some people in Washington would like. That is the mandate of the 1994 election, and that is a responsibility we will not discharge.

Balancing the Federal budget is not a trivial issue. It is about the role of Government and our Nation's future. While some oppose balancing the budget, and hope and pray that we fail, we want this to be a bipartisan, unifying way that includes the President. He repeatedly says that he supports a balanced budget. He called for a balanced budget in 5 years in his campaign when he was running in 1992, and has hinted that he would even support the idea that it can be balanced in 7 years. He should sign onto this fundamental compact with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep our eyes set on our ultimate goals. We will balance the Federal budget, save the Medicare system for a generation of retirees, end welfare as we know it, and implement a tax cut for families that increases the take home pay of workers and creates private sector jobs.

This rule will permit the House to approve a fiscally responsible continuing resolution so that we can get back to accomplishing those critical goals without unnecessary diversions. I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can proceed with balancing the budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this is staring to get ridiculous. This bill is as dead as dead can be, but my Republican colleagues are determined to waste time on it anyway. President Clinton said that he would veto any continuing resolution with extraneous provisions, and I believe him.

So why are we wasting time on this one? Why is the Federal Government still closed? Why did 200,000 seniors who tried to call the 1-800 helpline for Social Security get no help today?

Why were over 7,000 American veterans unable to file claims today? Why were 781,000 people turned away from national parks and monuments?

Why were 99,000 tourists shut out of Smithsonian Museums, the National Zoo, the Kennedy Center, and the National Gallery of Art?

Why were 45,000 Americans unable to get their passports? Why were 700 recruits unable to enlist in our Nation's Armed Forces?

Because, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues insist on playing partisan games with this continuing resolution. They insist on attaching totally unrelated provisions designed to make a political point.

Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of a continuing resolution is to keep the Government running while Congress works to pass the appropriations bills. A continuing resolution should not be used to further a political agenda. A continuing resolution is not to blackmail the President.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution should be clean and bipartisan, plain and simple. But this one is not.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the American people expect more from Congress. They expect House Republicans to stop fiddling around and get the job done, and it could be very, very easy.

Democrats and Republicans can pass a clean continuing resolution right this minute. The President will sign it, and the Federal Government can start up again.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to stop these political games. Defeat this ridiculous rule. Let us give Americans their Government back.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Appleton, WI [Mr. ROTH], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the President is going to sign this new CR, and the reason I say that is because there is a Russian proverb that says two mountains can never come together, but two men always can. I believe the Congress and the President, if they will use good faith, can come together. The reason I think the President is going to sign this bill is because no one wants to see the Government shut down.

Now as I see it, Mr. Speaker, our side has made a good-faith effort. We did send the CR to the President, and the President has vetoed our first initiative. Now here we are with a continuing resolution. A balanced budget is our commitment on this side of the aisle, and, quite frankly, to be fair with President Clinton, he also has put forth a balanced budget as his commitment, as he said in the 1992 Presidential election, that he will balance the budget inside of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in politics today a person's or party's word must be their bond. We gave our commitment to the American people that we would balance the budget in 7 years. The President said that he was going to do it in 5.

Now here we have before us a resolution, and basically this is the bill, H.J. Res. 122, and a short paragraph in the back basically states that the President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Congress to achieve an unified balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

I think it is plain, it is straightforward, and I do believe that the President is going to sign this legislation because basically what we want to do is not only have our essential people work. Do my colleagues know essential people working for the Government are working now, but nonessential people are not, but both are getting paid, essential and nonessential? So we have

people working for the Government whether it is in mail, or whether it is in medical care, whether it is in Social Security checks going out, welfare benefits, veterans' hospital. All the essential people are working.

Let us pass this legislation and allow the nonessential people to go back to work because they are getting paid.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight, not because we do not have a 7-year commitment to a balanced budget and not because lots of other things have not happened. We are here tonight for one very simple reason, because this has not happened. This chart represents each of the 13 appropriation bills which are supposed to pass in order for the Congress to fulfill its obligations. We have only passed three. So, Mr. Speaker, we have over 90 percent of the Government represented by these 10 appropriations bills still not passed through the appropriations process. Most of those bills have been hung up because of the fights over extraneous issues such as the Interior bill that went down today because the majority party insists on continuing to reward Western mining interests with huge boondoggles. We have abortion tying up other bills. We have the Labor-HEW bill tied up simply because the Senate Republicans are so embarrassed by the extreme nature of the bill that passed the House that they would not even take it up. It is not the Democrats who will not take it up in the Senate, it is the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say that to point fingers. I say that simply to point out facts. This is our problem, not what is happening in some other committee on long-term budget problems. Our problem is that the Congress simply has not done its work.

Mr. Speaker, first we were told earlier in the week that the way to solve this was to double Medicare fees, and so for 2 days our Republican friends said we are going to hold the Government hostage until we double Medicare fees. Well, they decided they were getting burned on that in the court of public opinion, so now they have found a way to try to shift the argument, and, no, I will not yield until I finish.

I was shocked to see in the Associated Press an article which I think tells us why we are really here in what is the functional equivalent of an institutional temper tantrum, and I want to read this for my colleagues, Washington (AP), dateline today, Reporter Jill Lawrence:

An angry Newt Gingrich said Wednesday that Clinton administration snubs during lengthy flights to and from Yitzhak Rabin's funeral led to this week's budget impasse and government shutdown.

House Speaker Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole have been simmering

ever since their 25 hours in the air early this month.

"Both of us got on that airplane expecting to spend several hours talking about the budget and how do we avoid the shutdown," Gingrich said. "Every president we had ever flown with had us up front. Every president we had ever flown with had talked to us at length."

The lack of contact and their having to exit through the rear of the plane were "part of why you ended up with us sending down a tougher continuing resolution," Gingrich said in an extraordinary exchange with reporters at a breakfast meeting.

□ 2015

He then went on to admit "This is petty. I'm going to say up front it's petty, and Tony," meaning Blankley, his press secretary, "will probably say that I shouldn't say it, but I think it's human." Well, it may be human, but it is dead wrong, given the serious consequences facing this country.

Who are we kidding when people say, as someone just did, that it was the President who precipitated this crisis? The Speaker was quoted on April 3 as saying the following: "Gingrich boasted that the President will veto a number of things and will then put them all in the debt ceiling, and then he will decide how big a crisis he wants."

That was said on April 3, not after the President vetoed the continuing resolution. So I really think what we are looking at here tonight is the functional equivalent of an institutional temper tantrum brought on by the hurt feelings of the Speaker of the House because of his airplane episode. I think he ought to come down to earth and think about what the consequences are going to be for people on the surface of this globe, and they are not very pretty.

I also want to raise some basic questions about the wisdom of tying ourselves into a 7-year promise. If I thought that that 7-year promise would be kept, I would say by all means, let us make a promise right now to balance the budget in 7 years. But I want to point out, we have had a number of multiyear promises before.

In 1981, we had a promise from the President, President Reagan, that if we just passed his budget, we would balance the budget in 4 years. After it was passed, the President's Secretary of the Treasury, Donald Regan, said, "This is our program. It is now in place." This chart demonstrates the difference between the promise and the performance. They promised to take the deficit down from \$55 billion down to a \$1 billion surplus, does that sound familiar, in 4 years. They only missed by \$185 billion.

So then they produced Gramm-Rudman I. They said, "Okay, we are going to make a 7-year promise. We are going to get to zero," from what was then a \$172 billion deficit down to zero in 7 years. They passed it. They only missed by \$220 billion, represented by these red bars here.

Then they said, "Okay, we are going to try it again, baby," so they passed Gramm-Rudman II. That was a 5-year

promise to get us down from a \$144 billion deficit down to zero by 1992. You know what? They only missed by \$290 billion.

So I would say, beware of those bearing multiyear promises.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying "million" or "billion"?

Mr. OBEY. "Billion."

Mr. MOAKLEY. With a "B".

Mr. OBEY. With a "B", a big B. It fits with the big baloney we are being told to slice here tonight.

What we are being told is that we should buy into another multiyear promise, but I want to know what assumptions are behind that promise. How much are you planning to cut Social Security in order to get there in 7 years? How much are you planning to cut education, and how much will that squeeze educational opportunity for young people today? How much are you going to be providing in taxes to your rich friends?

Do we really have to buy into those assumptions in order to get a balanced budget? I do not think so. I am perfectly willing to sign on, in a minute, to a balanced budget if you will remove your tax cuts, if you will provide the President with a line item veto that applies to tax gifts as well as appropriations, so that he has all of the goodies that he can eliminate in order to hold to that timetable.

I am willing to do it if you have a civilized and fair distribution of burden on taxes and on education and all the rest. But I am not willing to buy into a 7-year timetable just on vague promises, buy into a 7-year promise with a blindfold on, simply based on your promise that you are going to get it right this time when you screwed it up three times before.

I would suggest we ought to quit all of the fancy promises, we ought to quit all of the past history, now that I have corrected some of the misstatements that we have had all day here, and what we ought to ask ourselves is one simple question: whether we will do what is right tonight, whether we will do what is right tonight to create a better future for our kids tomorrow. That is the choice before us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker, get over your personal pique, get over your hurt feelings about an airplane trip, grow up, and do what this country expects, which is to meet the immediate needs of the country in the fairest way possible.

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, I would ask him, these charts he has here on the broken promises, who was in control when all those promises were made? Who was in control?

Mr. OBEY. The Republicans controlled the Senate and Democrats controlled the House and the White House.

Mr. ROTH. No, you were in control for 40 continuous years.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, he is smart enough to know history. Do not rewrite it. You and I both lived it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Metairie, LA [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from California, yielding time to me. I certainly rise in support of the rule. I think it is a good rule. I commend the Committee on Rules for its work.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, would have left me his charts. I wanted to talk from them, but he walked off with them. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look at those Gramm-Rudman years. The fact is that our other friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], was right on the money. Back then, the Gramm-Rudman bill was primarily prompted by the Reagan administration and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who supported the Gramm-Rudman initiative were primarily Republicans, and we were in the minority.

In fact, Gramm-Rudman, if I recall correctly, got it start in 1987, which was after the Republicans were no longer in control of the U.S. Senate. By the way, 1987 and 1988 were the 2 years when all 13 appropriations bills were placed under continuing resolutions.

It was also the 2 years that led to the break from the Reagan years when we were downsizing the budget, that put us on an escalating path toward increased deficits. They are also the years that led up to a tax increase, in conjunction with the majority party meeting at Andrews Air Force Base in 1990, which gave us continued deficits, and an end to Gramm-Rudman. Because of the constraints, the strait-jacket of Gramm-Rudman was ripped apart, so that the gentleman who did not support Gramm-Rudman and did everything, along with so many other Members of the then-majority of the House and the then-majority of the Senate, to just simply disregard Gramm-Rudman.

Spending under the majority party's governance in both the House and Senate went up drastically. Gramm-Rudman did not work, because the majority did not abide by it. Now they are in the minority for exactly that reason. Finally, the American people said, "Okay, you have had your time at bat, 40 years at bat is enough, let us give somebody else another chance."

The Republicans are in control. We are taking this country toward a balanced budget by the year 2002, with or without you, with or without the President of the United States, without their cooperation if necessary, but we

are going to get there. There are going to be a lot of Democrats that are going to support us. There are going to be a lot of Republicans, Democrats, and independents around this Nation that are going to support us.

The bottom line is the downpayment is being made, no smoke, no gimmicks, no mirrors, no distortion. We are working within a balanced budget glide path to the year 2002, and our children and our grandchildren will prosper because of it.

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two points. The gentleman from Louisiana is one of the hardest working Members of this body, and when people say, "Hey, we have not done our work," I used and he used this card 797 times this year. Two years ago we used it about 500 times. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he not think the President is going to sign it? The President on his campaign trail says he is going to balance the budget in 5 years. The gentleman is giving him 7.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, 7 years. Mr. President, I hope you sign the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, just to correct the misstatement of history, Gramm-Rudman was passed in 1985, not 1987. The Republicans controlled the Senate when it happened. That is why it is named Gramm and Rudman.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to defeat this rule on the continuing resolution, because it does not allow an amendment that would take out the budget language that is objectionable to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is wrong for us to cut back or close down on Government agencies because of a disagreement in this House over the budget. That is essentially what we have here. The President says that he does not want to be bogged down by this 7-year budget language and the language that is in the CR with regard to the Congressional Budget Office.

I personally feel that the budget is wrong, as I have said many times, because it cuts Medicare in order to pay primarily for tax cuts for the wealthy. But I think that what we really should be doing is allowing a continuing resolution to pass that is clean, that does not get involved in the budget battle, and spend the time over the next few days or the next few weeks trying to come up with a compromise on the budget that is acceptable to both sides and that is acceptable to the President.

What is happening now is that basically the American people are being

asked to pay the price of the bickering that is going on in this House, that is going on, I should say, in this Congress. It is simply not fair. We know a lot of people came down to Washington the last couple of days and they want to see the monuments. Some of them had been waiting for the bill a year or two to do that. I have people in my office that have not been able to apply for Social Security benefits, for veterans' benefits, those who wanted to join the Armed Forces who have not been able to see a recruiter.

What the Republican leadership is basically saying is that "You have to have it our way. You have to go for the 7-year budget. You have to go with the CBO estimates. Otherwise, we are going to continue to close down the Government." They are essentially holding the Government, if you will, hostage to their view of the budget. It is not the proper way to proceed. We know there are disagreements on the budget. The way this rule provides, it does not allow for a clean CR. I think it is wrong, and for that reason it should be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Fairfax, VA [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I voted with the minority on Monday to recommit this bill and send a clean resolution to the President. I thought it was junked up. I wanted to get the Federal Government working again. I felt there were some extraneous matters that did not belong there.

But having said that, let me note that continuing resolutions with extraneous matters is not new to this body on the other side of the aisle. The nuclear waste policy amendments were put on in 1988, the Boland amendment, called the Central American Nicaraguan Promotion of Democracy Act were put on in about 1987, along with 8 other riders.

In 1984 we put on a comprehensive crime control act; in 1983, language designating part of the New Jersey Turnpike as part of the Interstate Highway System was put on a continuing resolution, as was a pay raise for House Members, as was the Ted Turner amendments, giving him tax breaks for cable operators; and in fiscal 1982, tax breaks for Members of this body were put on. So this has happened before, and Members on the other side are not being fair to say let us get a clean resolution now, when that has not been their history.

Having said that, let us get to where we are today. I hope what I am not hearing on the other side is, do it our way or no way. This side is showing flexibility. We have come back with another resolution, in light of the fact that the President would not sign what

was sent to him earlier. It is hardly an extraneous resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I think we have some of the same concerns, representing probably more Federal employees than any other Members in this body.

□ 2030

I am concerned when I turn to the last page. I want to understand what kind of commitment we are making. Quite frankly, while I can live with a balanced budget and think we probably ought to get there, I am not willing to accept \$270 billion cuts in Medicare nor am I willing to accept certain tax breaks.

Do you interpret this language to mean that we are making commitments to essentially your budget?

Mr. DAVIS. As my friend knows, I opposed the tax cuts. I was 1 of 10 Members on this side to oppose that. I understand all of that will be on the table. All of that will be on the table. This does not commit you to vote for \$270 billion in tax cuts. It does not commit you to vote for Medicare cuts. It is on the table to be negotiated between the President and Congress.

This is hardly blackmail. It is clean, simple. If the President vetoes this resolution, it is going to be clear it was not Medicare that led him to veto the last resolution. Medicare is not in here. It is not in here at all. It was not educational cuts. There is enough money in this resolution to keep the Department of Education running at present levels over the next 18 days. It was not the environment, because there is enough money in here to keep the EPA running for the next 18 days, which is what this resolution provides for.

So the excuses that were used for not signing the first resolution are not here in this case. It would only be because the President would not care about continuing the operations of government and would not care about balancing the budget, and I do not believe that. I do not believe that. I think the President will do the right thing. I think he will do the right thing for the country. I think he will do the right thing for Federal employees. I think he will do the right thing for the children and for our Nation's future by signing this resolution, this continuing resolution to keep the government going. I intend to support it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk a bit more about some of the really awful things that have happened by this government shutdown. Today in my State of Colorado they had to issue an emergency request for blood supply, for

blood supply, because this happens to be the time when they run the blood drive at the Federal center, and so many Federal employees give so generously, and during the holiday season we have all sorts of people come to visit, and they feel that if they do not get 400 units of blood a day during this period, we are in dire straits during the holiday season.

Now, we in our office have been asking people in Colorado to, please, go donate because this is very, very critical. But that is one more impact on top of people phoning our office day and night with all sorts of crises, from passports on, trying to figure out what to do.

I must say tonight I was very angry to look at the AP wire and see a headline saying the House Speaker says that the Air Force 1 snub led to the government shutdown, and he said that morning at a breakfast, according to the AP wire, that the reason he felt obligated to shut the government down was that the President did not come chat him up or chat with him when he was on the way to the funeral.

Now, I find this absolutely amazing.

Number one, it was a funeral for a head of State.

Number two, you had prior ex-Presidents sitting with the President and on, but to have that kind of temper tantrum and go through all the turbulence we have gone through this week is immaturity beyond belief, and I think this whole body deserves an apology if this story is correct, and it is not correct, then I hope the Speaker comes and corrects it.

Because, really, the turbulence and what has happened to the lives of those 800,000 people who have been thrown out on the street, what is happening to the taxpayers who are going to be paying those 800,000 people, thank goodness, but they are getting less service, they are going to be paying more money. And all of this is absolutely crazy.

But to read that it is all about ego, all about ego, when, according to this story, the Speaker was accorded all sorts of privileges no one else had. He got to bring his spouse, when the prior Presidents did not get to, which other people did not get to. He got all of those. But it seems it was not enough.

So I think there are days when I feel like I am in kindergarten or in a day care center. When I read about these kinds of tantrums, then I get these kinds of emergency cries saying the blood supply in Colorado is in jeopardy because of this issue, I am really disgusted, and I certainly hope we get some clarification of this AP wire story tonight.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vienna, VA [Mr. WOLF], who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations, understands how tough the work is to balance the budget.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. Quite

frankly, this body has become a partisan pit, and this town has become a partisan pit.

There are Members on our side who think we have too much. I think they are wrong. There are Members on this side who think we are asking too much of the President. I think you are wrong.

Merely what this does, it says in 7 years the President shall commit. It does not say how to reach a balanced budget, and I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the chairman, talked about Gramm-Rudman and all those things. I understand. What he said may have had some points. The times have changed. The American people, both Republicans and Democrats and liberals and conservatives, want a balanced budget. So all we are doing tonight, and I would say to both sides, come together, work together, all we are doing tonight is voting to open up the government tomorrow so the social security checks can go out, the veterans can get their things and all the government workers can go back to work then the President says, "Yes, I agree," as he said many other times, that we are going to have a balanced budget in 7 years.

It does not say how; it does not say how; it does not say how. It just says when, and when is the year 2002.

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

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Are you saying to this House that the tax cut is going to be on the table, the \$270 billion cut in Medicare is going to be on the table and negotiable, the doubling of the premium?

Mr. WOLF. That is why the American people cannot stand this place and cannot stand this town. That is not what I said.

I said we are doing tonight a continuing resolution to keep the Government open and merely saying to the President that we can come together in a bipartisan way. We throw the word "bipartisan" around this body. Very few people seem to meet it in this town. It says we will come together in a bipartisan way to try to reach a balanced budget in the year 2002. It does not say, it does not say how. It just says when, and the year is the year 2002.

Mr. KLECZKA. If the gentleman will yield further, I intend to support the dumb thing. I have to know whether these things are negotiable and on the table. I am not hearing "yes." You said that is not part of the debate tonight.

Mr. WOLF. I urge support of the resolution.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because this rule is necessary to pass a continuing resolution, and a continuing resolution is necessary to get us back into the business of governing responsibly.

We are not governing in a fiscally responsible manner when 800,000 Federal employees are sitting at home getting a paycheck, not being able to perform the work they need to perform. We are not governing in a morally responsible manner when 56,000 elderly people have already been unable to claim their social security and disability benefits, when more than 15,000 of America's veterans have not been able to file for their compensation, their pension and their education benefits, when more than a million people have tried to visit our national monuments and have not been able to because this Government has been shut down. That is not responsible. We are not doing our job.

This continuing resolution, I grant you, is not as clean as we would like it, but the reality is that a 7-year budget is attainable. Sixty-eight Democrats voted for a budget that can be achieved without even making as severe domestic discretionary cuts as are in the President's budget. It is doable.

One thing the President could do, it is up to him, if he believes that his forecasts are correct rather than CBO's, with the additional revenue that would come in from his economic revenue forecasts, that money can be used for tax cuts. But you do not pay out tax cuts when you are running at a deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and then of the continuing resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Harrisburg, PA [Mr. GEKAS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. There is only one issue before us. It is just a "yes" or "no" vote, a plain, solitary, vital issue. If we vote "yes," we are proceeding toward a balanced budget, a giant step towards a balanced budget. If we vote "no," we are saying that we are in favor of continual borrowing. We want the American people, if we vote "no," to continue to borrow money as citizens of this country, to pay a rising debt and interest on an already multitrillion-dollar debt. That is the issue.

Do we want to continue borrowing? If you do, then vote "no." If you want to take this simple, ecstatic step towards a balanced budget that could occur in 7 years, you vote "yes."

Why is this so important? Have we made it clear to the American people that if we reach a balanced budget, we can stop borrowing money? Because every time we borrow money, we take away from the community, we take away from homes, we take away from schools, we take away from enterprises the wherewithal to do a better job in creating jobs and hiring people and promoting education and promoting all the societal needs all of us agree must be met.

So we are forcing ourselves, by continuing to borrow, to neglect our communities. So what happens if we reach a balanced budget? No longer will we have to use extra money to pay interest on the debt. We can take that money and invest it in our thresholds at home. That is what the rationale is behind a balanced budget.

If you vote "yes," you are voting to allow the communities in 7 years and the local enterprises to blossom into a new kind of prosperity that will come with the turn of the century. If you vote "no" on this, you want to borrow into the next century until the year 2000 and 50 beyond.

Vote "yes."

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been asking good questions. Why has the Federal Government been shut down? Why are veterans at risk of not receiving their checks and their disability payments? Why are senior citizens, social security recipients not able to have their cases processed? Why has their national Government for the first time in two centuries been put at risk, at the brink of national bankruptcy?

Well, my colleagues, tonight we find the answer. The answer is because the Speaker of the House was snubbed on an airplane ride. The Speaker of the House was snubbed on an airplane ride. Unless anybody thinks this is a David Letterman top ten joke, let me refer to an Associated Press article today, the headline of which is, "Air Force 1 Snub Led to Government Shutdown."

Quoting the article, "The lack of contact and their having to exit through the rear of the plane were," quoting the Speaker, "part of why you ended up with us sending down a tougher continuing resolution."

The Speaker goes on to say, "This is petty. I am going to say up front it is petty, and Tony will probably say I shouldn't say it, but I think it is human."

Well, it may be human, but it is petty, and certainly it must be the first time in the history of this country that our Nation's economy has been put at risk, hundreds of thousands of people have been put out of work because of the seat assignment and service on an airplane ride.

The Speaker, in the same article, went on to say that, "Every other President, every President we have ever flown with has had us up front. Every President we have had has talked to us at length."

My friends, it is time for us to put the pettiness aside and get on with the serious business of governing our Nation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Davenport, IA [Mr. LEACH], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, what is at issue tonight is whether Congress has the spine to stop spending dollars we do not have, not whether the President can find a spinal column and through the veto stand up for something, in this case, continued deficit financing.

□ 2045

Here let us be clear. What the White House is blatantly engaging in is an effort to divide society along age-group lines. The President is attempting to appeal, as if he is compassionate, to the young and the old with other people's money.

Yet, what young people have a vested interest in is ending the deficit. It is they, after all, that will be spending their working lives paying for past legislative excesses. It is they who want lower interest rates to buy a home, to save for their kids to go to college.

What the baby-boom generation wants, those aged 40 to 55, is to have a solvent Medicare system when they retire.

And what the elderly want is inflation not to rob them of their savings, as it did in the late 1970's.

No age group in America, young or old, has a vested interest in fiscal profligacy.

Mr. Speaker, let me stress the basics. The Republican approach includes a 3-percent-a-year increase in spending. This is not radical. It is common sense. It is an inflation-adjusted freeze.

As for Medicare, it is the single largest programmatic increase in the Republican budget. It will go up at 6.4 percent a year, which in relation to increases in Medicare over the last decade. This is a reasonable, socially responsible set of guidelines.

Like all of us, I might disagree with some of the parts, but a 7-year achievement of a balanced budget is the least Congress can do for the American people at this particular time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the level of the rhetoric has necessarily increased or advanced the case to be made for the Republican side this evening, but whether my colleagues are Republican or Democrat, if they are going to be using the phrase "balancing the budget," I have been down on the floor before and I will be here again, and I am going to ask whether or not these numbers are going to be honest.

Are we talking about reducing the deficit or are we talking about balancing the budget? This, after all, is a continuing resolution. It is only going to take us up until December. The fundamentals are what have to be met.

Mr. Speaker, I am maintaining that no one has come to the floor yet, to my knowledge, to refute this point: The Republican budget, ostensibly balancing the budget in the year 2002, is going to start next year by taking in the neighborhood of \$63 billion from the Social Security trust fund. It is going to take an increasing amount every year until 2002. In the year in which the Republican budget claims that it will have somewhere between a \$10 billion to \$12 billion surplus, that figure will be achieved by taking \$115 billion, approximately, from the Social Security trust fund.

At this point at which Republicans claim that the budget has been balanced, we will be some \$636 billion in debt, plus interest, to the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Members to think about it, Democrats and Republicans. If we are going to do a balanced budget, I am willing to work on that along with everybody else. But please do not come down to the floor in a discussion of a continuing resolution and continue to repeat this canard, this misleading approach about a balanced budget.

If it is truly in surplus, then give it back. Reduce the amount of funds that have to come in from Social Security, if it is genuinely a surplus.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes and 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Madison, MI [Mr. SMITH], my friend and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE]. Is it not a shame that this is a balanced budget that still borrows money from the trust fund in 2002? The gentleman is absolutely correct, because this balanced budget is a very modest balanced budget. We should do much more.

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years the Democrats have been in control of this Congress, and we have been going deeper and deeper in debt. We now have a debt of \$4.9 trillion. The year 1996 is the first of a 7 year effort. The spending in this first year is the most modest of any of the 7 years, and yet the whining and moaning and complaining we hear.

Mr. Speaker, how can we expect this Congress to have the intestinal fortitude to do what needs to be done. And that means not only balancing the budget, but starting to pay back the debt, stop borrowing from the trust funds?

Mr. Speaker, I need to say this in my last few seconds. The last few speakers on the Democrat side have not talked about this rule. They have not talked

about the fact that this is a clean CR, except that it says, "Let us balance the budget in 7 years, according to CBO." Let us just do it!

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and his kindness in requesting that I come back.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, so it is a fact that the Republican budget will be taking some \$600 billion from the Social Security trust fund in order to achieve its version of a balanced budget? The gentleman did say that during his comments; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it is a fact that this Congress has been pulling a sham on the American people by using the Social Security trust funds for the last 40 years.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I again ask the gentleman is it a fact that this is going to take \$636 billion, approximately, for the next 7 years, from the Social Security trust fund? Mr. Speaker, that question will hang in the air.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a quick vocabulary lesson for any American who wants to follow this beltway budgetary battle.

You see, the Republicans are now trying to tell us that this new version of the concurrent resolution is so simple that we just have to accept it. They are right—their plan is simple. In fact, it's so simple, it can be summed up in three simple words. That is right—there are only three simple words you need to know to follow the Republicans' budget antics. Here they are: Cut. Gut. And shut.

The Republicans will cut the safety net that helps the poor and elderly live healthy lives. They will gut every environmental law that protects the food we eat and the air we breathe. And until they get their way—they will shut the door of government services that help veterans who served our country and students who want to serve. Cut. Gut. And shut. That is the entire GOP plan.

Now, Republicans are outraged that the President would use his veto. Well, for them, I offer not a vocabulary lesson, but a civics lesson. Remember—this is just a part of our American system of "checks and balances."

Unfortunately, when many Republicans think about "checks," they can only picture the huge campaign checks that paid for their election. When they hear "balances," they only think about a budget "balanced" on the backs of working families.

Mr. GINGRICH: instead of "cut, gut and shut," please cut out the political posturing, show some guts, and shut the door on the special interest lobbyists who financed your election. That's

the simple solution that all Americans want.

And that's why we need to defeat this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research of the Committee on Science.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this is it. All of the conditions in the continuing resolution have been removed except for one: that we reach a balanced budget through a common procedure; in this case, over 7 years using Congressional Budget Office economic projections.

Both of those conditions have previously been agreed to by the President of the United States. There is no commitment in voting for this continuing resolution in supporting the Republican plan or any other plan.

Mr. Speaker, the question was asked what will be on the table, and the point is that the President of the United States can put anything on the table he wants, as long as it will balance the budget in 7 years and uses Congressional Budget Office economic figures.

So, if the President does not like our budget, the President can offer his own budget, only as long as it meets the same standards that we have used for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, this is really a vote to decide who supports a balanced budget and who does not. Dozens upon dozens of our Democratic Party colleagues voted for a 7-year balanced budget. I hope they will do so again.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from East Petersburg, PA [Mr. WALKER], chair of the very important Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not sad and tragic and somewhat pathetic that the people who oppose the balanced budget can only come to the floor and attack the Speaker? It is the only thing that they have left.

Mr. Speaker, it really is kind of tragic, folks. The fact is that many of the American people have come to the conclusion that the Government is too big and spends too much. They figure that the way to stop that problem is to balance the budget.

That is what this is all about. A large number of people have been bragging for weeks out here about how they voted for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That was about 7 years. A substantial number of people have come to the floor and talked about how they voted for alternative balanced budgets in the course of the year. Those are all 7 years.

All the language says tonight is that we are going to commit, we and the President, to a contract. That that is what we are going to do. All of the people who have voted on both sides of the aisle for a balanced budget of some type in the course of this year, or for the balanced budget amendment to the



Constitution, tonight will prove whether or not they meant it for real.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Portland, ME [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting debate tonight. It was barely 8 or 10 months ago that on this floor 300 Members voted for the balanced budget amendment, including a significant number of Members from the other side of the aisle.

Not only that, but there were a number of Members that stood up in the well of this House and piously intoned how they could not support a balanced budget amendment, because what we really needed to do was to have a Congress with the will to make the tough decisions.

My, my, my. Well, tonight we have a clean continuing resolution. Frankly, we should have had it a week ago, maybe even 6 or 8 weeks ago, because I think we should have started the new fiscal year on the assumption that we are going to balance the budget within 7 years, just like 300 Members voted back in January.

Mr. Speaker, tonight is where the rubber meets the road. Who means what they say or who is just down here posturing?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing magical about 7 years. Our Republican friends made a promise in their Contract With America that the fictional 7 years was important. I say fiction, because they know and the American people really know, that we are not able to bind future Congresses any more than we have been bound by previous Congresses.

We will not balance the budget in 7 years. We will create more pain for the elderly; more pain for the young; more pain for veterans; more pain for American citizens. It is simply a question, when trying to balance the budget, of whether or not we are going to do it in a certain time frame.

□ 2100

You have come up with 7 years. I could do it in 3 with a lot of pain. I could do it in 10 with less pain. There is not a damn thing magical about 7 years.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Birmingham, AL [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago on "Larry King Live," candidate Bill Clinton made a promise to the American people to balance the budget in 5 years. He spoke of a balanced budget as both an obligation to our children and a necessity of our country.

Tonight we will give him an opportunity to make good on his promise to the American people. To balance the budget—not in 2 more years as he originally promised, or in 5 years from tonight. No, we ask simply that he commit to a real balanced budget in 7 years. Seven years.

Tonight is his and our moment of truth. Tonight he, and we in this body, will be given the opportunity to choose between higher taxes and a bigger, more costly, more reaching Federal bureaucracy, and, on the other hand, lower taxes on American families, and a smaller, more effective, less intrusive Washington.

Will Bill Clinton choose the latter, as he promised? Will he keep his word? Or will he break his promise to the American people, to our children, and the future generations, and in the process, shut the Federal Government down.

The choice is first ours, and then Bill Clinton's. It's promise keeping time. Mr. President?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Palm Bay, FL [Mr. WELDON], a hard-working new Member.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I was running for Congress in 1994, I had many, many people who told me they had never worked on a campaign before and never donated to a campaign before who got involved with getting me elected to Congress.

I remember one fellow, Doug Jackson, told me he had saved up some money for a new entertainment center in his living room. He had no furniture in his living room and he gave me that money. I tried to talk him out of it. I asked him, why are you doing this? He told me he was concerned about the future for his children regarding the problems with education and crime in our country. But the most important thing he cited was deficit spending, the debt that this nation was incurring.

I am rising today to speak out in strong support of this rule and this continuing resolution which will finally for the first time commit us to what Doug Jackson sent me to the U.S. Congress for, and that is finally balancing the books here in Washington. I am very encouraged to hear that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to be joining with us tonight, but I am very disappointed by the words of the President. I do not know why he does not want to join with us. Clearly the American people want a balanced budget. They spoke clearly in 1994. I urge all my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3 minutes and 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Process of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from greater metropolitan San

Dimas, CA, distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding time to me.

It is a good rule. It is an appropriate rule. It is a timely rule, and I urge its support, and this debate is about the rule.

Mr. Speaker, most everyone in the country agrees that we need to. That is why we have this good rule. But most also think it is very important that we stick to our commitment to balance the budget in 7 years and if the President can commit to that, then this limited government shutdown problem will get resolved very quickly if not immediately.

Americans want this budget balanced by 2002 or sooner, as my friend from Florida noted. In fact, the calls and faxes to our offices today tell the story. Not the predetermined poll results of the liberal media but the calls and faxes that came into my office, they were running up to 7 to 1 in favor of the balanced budget and get on with it.

I note that the President has said over and over that he thinks he wants a balanced budget, too. Unfortunately, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's best plan leaves this country \$200 billion in the red, in deficit, in the year 2002, while our plan does balance the budget.

There is no plausible reason for the President to veto this bill unless he really does not want a balanced budget. And in the spirit of bipartisanship, we have created a cleaner CR for him now. There are no more excuses. Now is the time to sign. We hope he is going to do the right thing and so do most Americans.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I find this an extraordinary circumstance. I think every one of us anticipated that we would be at this crisis point about this time in the calendar year. Why? Because we assumed the President would have used his veto power and there would be so many issues that we would be in conflict on, bills unresolved. Mr. Speaker, I think we all assumed we would be at a point of conflict because the President had exercised his veto authority and, therefore, appropriations bill after bill would be before this body for override and then perhaps because we would fail to do so, each would end up in a CR.

But this is a contrived crisis. This is not a result of a clash between the President and his veto pen and this Congress. We have not even sent him most of the bills to veto. He made one veto of the legislative branch bill because, as he said, he wanted us to feel the pain of a government shutdown and not exempt our selves. Now, all of the remainder of our appropriations bills have not even been sent to him. We



have not sent a budget resolution. It was supposed to have been passed 6 weeks ago. The debt limit would have been dealt with in the context of that.

So we are in a contrived crisis tonight. Of course public opinion was not serving the new majority well. They did not look well jacking up Medicare rates on senior citizens so they tried a new tact. They have begun to peel back the onion, begun to try to put together something that on the surface looks like a cleaner CR.

But there is one little hooker in it. It relates to the concept of a 7-year balanced budget. I am for a 7-year balanced budget. I have voted not only for the Stenholm resolution, but I have voted for the balanced budget proposal that was made on our side by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. But I took that position in the context of a detailed alternative to what the Republicans have offered.

For example, I do not believe we ought to be cutting taxes for people at the upper income level by \$250 billion. So what I would like to say, if I could have the attention of my Republican colleagues, is we cannot pull out the 7-year issue from the context of all of the components of a balanced budget. When you do not deal with taxes—whether you increase them on working people or cut them for the wealthy. When you do not deal with the question of how much you are going to cut Medicare or how much you are going to cut Medicaid; when you do not deal with the other demands that have to be part of what will constitute a balanced budget plan, you cannot legitimately come here and ask us to take one issue—the time frame to reach balance—off the table.

It is a complex combination of policies that will get us to a balanced budget in 7 years. If we have no ability to cut back on the massive tax cuts or reduce the Medicare cuts, for example we may have to go beyond 7 years to 8. Those of us on this side who have stood up for a 7-year balanced budget have done so laying out our policies that differed dramatically with your Republican plan, but we cannot simply concede that time line without knowing the details.

We ought to be given the opportunity to allow the give and take between the executive and the legislative branches, between the President and your majority, to take place without it being circumscribed tonight by this rider. This is not a clean CR. It ought to be defeated, and then we ought to go about the business of bringing the bills to the President so he can exercise his authority to sign or veto them. A clean CR is what we need tonight. Not another political gesture.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Stamford, CT [Mr. SHAYS], a senior

member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 2 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, former Prime Minister Rabin of Israel once said, politicians are elected by adults to represent the children. Children do not vote. They do not respond to political polls, but they ultimately are the ones who will be helped or hurt by what we do here. That is why we are determined to get our financial house in order and balance our budgets.

We are determined to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, and we are determined to transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society. For our children, we are determined to balance our Federal budgets within 7 years with or without the help of the President. And we are doing it by increasing the earned income tax credit from \$19.8 billion to \$27.5 billion. The school lunch program, from \$6.3 billion to \$7.8 billion. The student loan program from \$24.5 billion to \$36 billion. The Medicaid program from \$89 billion to \$124 billion. The Medicare program from \$178 billion to \$278 billion.

Only in Washington, when you spend so much money for our children, do some people call it a cut in spending. Over 300 Members of this House supported a balanced budget amendment in 7 years, Republicans and Democrats. We are asking the President to join with 300 Members, well over two-thirds of this body, to get our financial house in order. Balance this budget and save this future for our children.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an aye vote on this resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 176, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 800]

YEAS—249

Allard  
Archer  
Armed  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)

Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley

Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning

Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremins  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)

Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Luther  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCormack  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinar  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon

Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahmabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisk  
Skeel  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souders  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NAYS—176

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Berman  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn

Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutscher  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo

Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gedden  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard

Hinchey	Meehan	Sabo
Holden	Meek	Sanders
Hoyer	Menendez	Sawyer
Jackson-Lee	Mfume	Schroeder
Jacobs	Miller (CA)	Schumer
Jefferson	Minge	Serrano
Johnson (SD)	Mink	Skaggs
Johnson, E. B.	Moakley	Skelton
Johnston	Mollohan	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Murtha	Spratt
Kaptur	Nadler	Stark
Kennedy (MA)	Neal	Stenholm
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Stokes
Kennelly	Obey	Studds
Kildee	Olver	Stupak
Klink	Ortiz	Tejeda
LaFalce	Orton	Thompson
Lantos	Owens	Thornton
Levin	Pallone	Thurman
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Torres
Lincoln	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Lipinski	Payne (VA)	Towns
Lofgren	Pelosi	Velazquez
Lowey	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Maloney	Pickett	Visclosky
Manton	Pomeroy	Ward
Markey	Poshard	Waters
Martinez	Rahall	Watt (NC)
Mascara	Rangel	Waxman
Matsui	Reed	Wilson
McCarthy	Richardson	Wise
McDermott	Rivers	Woolsey
McHale	Roemer	Wyden
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
McNulty	Rush	

## NOT VOTING—7

Fields (LA)	Tucker	Yates
Houghton	Volkmer	
Rose	Waldholtz	

□ 2132

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

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP- PROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-344)

The Committee on Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2126) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after further full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:*

## TITLE I

## MILITARY PERSONNEL

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change

of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$19,946,187,000.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$17,008,563,000.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$5,885,740,000.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$17,207,743,000.

## RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$2,122,466,000.

## RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the

Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$1,355,523,000.

## RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$378,151,000.

## RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$784,586,000.

## NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$3,242,422,000.

## NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \$1,259,627,000.

## TITLE II

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$14,437,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; \$18,321,965,000 and, in addition, \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.