

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be glad to yield for a quick question to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Well, you know, sending out these flyers, what you have done, you have let the people who are going to get the big tax breaks sit in on the committee markups. Which is the worse?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question was simple. How many of you all do this at taxpayer expense, and how many of you will pledge to stop doing it? That is all my question is. I think this is an abuse of the franking privilege. You can read that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have already gone over it. But I say it is time we stop this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised not to conduct straw polls in the House.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO].

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

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, you know, I came here because I did not understand all this rhetoric that is going on. I still do not understand it. For one, you hear about education, "the backs of education." The very truth of the matter is simple: Education in this country stinks. It is that simple. Now, I do not understand why we would pour more money at a lousy educational system and get the results that we are getting. But we are saying we are taking education away.

We are not. I cannot send my kids to a public school. It is so lousy, I would not dare abuse my children. So that is just a bunch of nonsense. Education, they had better reform it. So we are not doing anything on the backs of education.

Now, see, as an average guy, I would say, why did the President come up here and why did I sit here and hear him say "Let's use CBO numbers?"

□ 1100

Why did he say that? Has anyone said why he said that? Why did he say use CBO numbers? I do not understand. He said that. I guess the kindest thing to say is he was not telling the truth when he said that.

Look, my colleagues, here is the issue. We have to balance this budget. Otherwise, we hit a wall going 180 miles an hour. It is not as complicated as all this rhetoric that we hear by these expert politicians. It is we must balance the budget.

Now, if they wanted to balance the budget, they had 40 years to balance the budget. We are now confronting that issue. We cannot back down from that.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a report on time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office this morning watching the proceedings of the House, and it brought to mind a movie which I liked very much, called "Groundhog Day" with Bill Murray. Every time the clock radio went off in that movie, on would come the former speaker, Congressman BONO, singing "I Got You, Babe." No matter what morning came along, every morning the same song was playing on the clock radio.

That is what is going on on the House floor here. It strikes me that the political rhetoric in this debate is getting repetitive, tired, and sad. Members are getting short-tempered because we are making no progress whatsoever. The Republicans insist they are saving America. We Democrats think they are saving America. Speaker GINGRICH thinks the idea of a 7-year balanced budget came to him in a dream. We think it could turn out to be an economic nightmare.

Frankly, what is in store for us here is to finally put aside some of this hot rhetoric, sit down, Democrats and Republicans, President and congressional leaders, and get this mess resolved.

Were we not sent to Washington to solve problems? I think we were. What we see here is a lot of pettiness, a lot of vitriol, and, frankly, very little progress.

The saddest part of it all is that there are some real victims in this political debate. Seven hundred thousand Federal employees as of Monday will still be on the streets without pay; 700,000 people being held hostage to this kind of political debate. That is outrageous.

It is nothing short of outrageous as well that while these people are on the streets without pay Members of Congress will still get their paychecks. How can we send these people home without pay while Members of Congress still get paid?

That is why I have introduced no budget, no pay. It says to Members of Congress, if we are serious about turning people out on the streets without a paycheck, cut off the machine that writes our paychecks. And Members know what will happen. We will not take this 48-hour adjournment recess the Republicans have proposed. We will stay here and do the job as we should. Get it done.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the gentleman there is nothing that prevents him from going ahead and doing the pilot project and not taking his check.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. No; I will not.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Colorado has the time, and he can choose whether or not to yield. He does not choose to yield.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the second thing I would ask the preceding speaker is to amend his bill so that it includes the President of the United States; and the third thing that I would mention to the previous speaker is he talks about 700,000 Federal employees, and my bet is that these people will, while they are furloughed, they will be paid for that period of time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will suspend. The Members are advised that the time used by the floor manager in commenting on the substance of the debate is counted against his time.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. MCINNIS. Again, Mr. Speaker, to the previous speaker, the gentleman talks about 700,000 so-called hostages, Federal employees who will be paid while they are on this furlough, but he continually, every day that there is a speech by the gentleman, he continually fails to mention that 230 or 260 million people in this country are held hostage by the deficit, which is accumulating at \$30 million an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are really here to end the sham, the scam. If Members will recall when Bill Clinton, before he was President, I saw him with my own eyes. I have a little bit of nearsightedness, but I saw him, I heard him. I am not visually or hearing impaired, and I heard him. He was running for office, and he promised to balance the budget in 5 years. We heard him.

Now, I am sure you have seen the recent commercial. We also have Bill Clinton saying, I think it can be done. Well, it can. First of all, it can be done in 7 years. That is May 1995. Then we heard 10 years, then we heard 9 years and 8 years. . . .

Mr. HOYER. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICA. We are going to nail down the balanced budget.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Under the rules, the gentleman cannot say any more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will be seated.

□ 1110

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would state for the RECORD that my words in fact were referring to the budget, and at no time would I refer to the President, and I ask unanimous consent that they be stricken.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman have been taken down. I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw his words?

Mr. MICA. Yes, I do, I ask unanimous consent.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would gladly apologize.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is supposed to sit down until the words have been taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

We heard him now, I am sure you have seen the recent commercial. We also have Bill Clinton saying, I think it can be done. Well, it can be done, first of all it can be done in 7 years. That is May 1995. Then we heard him in 10 years, then we heard 9 years, and 8 years. Well, my colleagues, we are here to nail the little bugger down, and that is the purpose of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, there is an improper reference to the President of the United States and the remarks are not in order.

Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Without objection, the gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. HOYER. We will object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state it.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman from Florida's words are taken down, are not his privileges on the floor suspended for the day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The privilege of debate for the gentleman would be suspended unless the House permits the gentleman to proceed in order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House allow the gentleman to speak for the rest of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] to allow the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] to proceed in order.

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

Mr. LINDER. 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 199, nays 189, answered “present” 26, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 816]

YEAS—199

Allard	Fox	Molinari
Archer	Frank (MA)	Moorhead
Army	Franks (CT)	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Frisa	Norwood
Ballenger	Funderburk	Nussle
Barr	Galleghy	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Ganske	Paxon
Barton	Gekas	Pombo
Bass	Gephardt	Porter
Bateman	Gilchrest	Portman
Bereuter	Gillmor	Quillen
Bilbray	Gilman	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Ramstad
Bliley	Goss	Regula
Boehlert	Graham	Riggs
Boehner	Greenwood	Roberts
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Rogers
Bono	Hall (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Hancock	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Royce
Bunn	Hastert	Salmon
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Sanford
Burton	Hayworth	Saxton
Buyer	Hefley	Scarborough
Callahan	Heineman	Schaefer
Calvert	Herger	Schiff
Canady	Hilleary	Seastrand
Chabot	Hoke	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Hostettler	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Houghton	Shaw
Christensen	Hunter	Shays
Chryslers	Hutchinson	Shuster
Clement	Hyde	Skeen
Clinger	Inglis	Smith (MI)
Coble	Istook	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Johnson (CT)	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)
Combest	Jones	Solomon
Cooley	Kasich	Souder
Costello	Kelly	Spence
Cox	Kim	Stearns
Crane	King	Stockman
Crapo	Kingston	Stump
Creameans	Klug	Talent
Cubin	Knollenberg	Tate
Cunningham	Kolbe	Tauzin
Deal	LaHood	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Largent	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Thornberry
Dickey	Laughlin	Tiahrt
Doggett	Lazio	Torkildsen
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Upton
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Vucanovich
Duncan	Lightfoot	Waldholtz
Dunn	Linder	Walker
Ehrlich	Lucas	Walsh
Emerson	Manzullo	Watt (NC)
English	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Ensign	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McHugh	Weller
Ewing	McInnis	White
Fawell	McIntosh	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Young (AK)
Flanagan	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Foley	Meyers	Zeliff
Forbes	Mica	
Fowler	Miller (FL)	

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Green	Olver
Ackerman	Gunderson	Ortiz
Andrews	Gutierrez	Orton
Baessler	Hall (OH)	Owens
Baldacci	Hamilton	Pallone
Barcia	Harman	Pastor
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hilliard	Pelosi
Berman	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Holden	Pickett
Bonior	Horn	Pomeroy
Borski	Hoyer	Poshard
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Quinn
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Reed
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Richardson
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Rivers
Camp	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Roukema
Chapman	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Clayton	Klecicka	Sabo
Clyburn	Klink	Sanders
Coleman	LaFalce	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Levin	Schumer
Condit	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Conyers	Lincoln	Serrano
Coyne	Lipinski	Siskisky
Cramer	Lofgren	Skaggs
Danner	Lowey	Skelton
de la Garza	Luther	Slaughter
DeFazio	Maloney	Spratt
DeLauro	Manton	Stark
Dellums	Markey	Stenholm
Deutsch	Martinez	Stokes
Dicks	Mascara	Studds
Dingell	Matsui	Stupak
Dooley	McCarthy	Tanner
Doyle	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McKinney	Tejeda
Edwards	McNulty	Thompson
Engel	Meenan	Thornton
Eshoo	Meek	Thurman
Evans	Menendez	Torres
Farr	Mfume	Torricelli
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Towns
Fazio	Minge	Trafigant
Filner	Mink	Velazquez
Flake	Moakley	Vento
Foglietta	Mollohan	Visclosky
Ford	Montgomery	Ward
Frost	Moran	Waters
Furse	Murtha	Williams
Gedensson	Myers	Wise
Geren	Nadler	Woolsey
Gibbons	Neal	Wyden
Gonzalez	Nethercutt	Wynn
Goodling	Oberstar	Yates
Gordon	Obey	Zimmer

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—26

Bachus	Franks (NJ)	Ney
Barrett (WI)	Frelinghuysen	Parker
Bartlett	Hobson	Petri
Blute	LaTourette	Pryce
Burr	Leach	Rohrabacher
Castle	LoBiondo	Wamp
Davis	Longley	Wicker
Dixon	Martini	Wolf
Ehlers	Morella	

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (LA)	Jefferson	Rose
Brewster	Livingston	Tucker
Dornan	McCrery	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	McDermott	Waxman
Hayes	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Jacobs	Oxley	Wilson

□ 1136

Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HEFLEY, COSTELLO, and SHAYS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. PETRI, PARKER, WAMP, LONGLEY, LOBIONDO, FRELINGHUYSEN, NEY, and BARRETT of Wisconsin changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] may proceed in order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, first I want to apologize for the inconvenience that I have caused the House. I did ask unanimous consent to have my remarks withdrawn.

I hold the House in great honor and really consider it a tremendous privilege to serve here. As Members know, my family served on that side of the aisle. It is a great institution. I do nothing to shed any bad light on the House and apologize if any words that I, in fact, made were improper to each and every one of you personally, but I guess we get emotional in this.

I never went to law school and sometimes I come up here and say things I should not say. I probably should choose better words. But, like some of you, I missed my son's football game last night, I did not get a chance to get the house cleaned today with my wife for Thanksgiving.

You really think about the reason we are here is to balance our budget and to get our Government's finances in order.

I know everybody on this side wants to do that with compassion and care. That is the reason we are all here and to try and do a good job to get our country's finances in order and to be responsible as Representatives of the people.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, quite frankly my constituents do not quite understand why we are behaving the way we are today, when it is my constituents, when it is the Federal worker, when it is the taxpayer, when it is the person who needs Federal services that has the right to be outraged and to lose their patience from what we are not doing in this Chamber.

Let me bring us back to the rule that is before us that will permit us to have a continuing resolution so that our veterans, Social Security benefits, and Medicare can be processed. That is a reasonable request, a continuing resolution for those purposes.

My constituents are asking why can we not have a continuing resolution for the other agencies of Government? If it is simple enough under suspension of the rules to pass authority to spend money for veterans, Social Security, and Medicare, why can we not do it for all of the appropriations where this House has not sent to the President an appropriation bill?

My constituents are being inconvenienced not just on Social Security and veterans' checks but on their inability to get a passport processed, on their in-

ability to have other Government services performed. They are outraged because our agencies are closed, we are telling Federal workers to stay home and be paid for the services that are not being performed, we are in fiscal crisis, and we are doing that?

If we can pass a continuing resolution without holding the President hostage on these areas, then why can we not come together and pass a continuing resolution on all of the agencies of Federal Government?

Do not bring up the balanced budget or other issues. Many of us support balancing the budget in 7 years. We can debate that on the budget. Not on a continuing resolution.

You are showing willingness for veterans, Social Security, and Medicare, then show a way to do it for all of our agencies.

Yes, let us support this, but let us bring up a continuing resolution for all Government services.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at this stage of the rule debate that we focus on what this debate is about, and that is the rule. I would like to just repeat that House Resolution 275 is a straightforward resolution. The proposed rule merely provides that it shall be in order at any time today for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Committee on Rules agreed to the amendment to the rule by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] which provides that the matters being considered under suspension will be announced from the House floor at least 1 hour prior to consideration and that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the majority leader or his designee prior to consideration under this resolution.

This resolution, this rule, was taken out of the Committee on Rules by unanimous vote. I think it is especially important that the remaining speakers focus on the issue of the rule.

□ 1145

By passing this resolution, we are attempting to speed up the process so we can reopen the Government as soon as possible while keeping the commitment to the American people to balance this budget within a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would focus on the rule, except for 10 seconds ago I had talked about the balanced budget, so I am going to have to do that. It is a good rule.

I think my colleagues on the other side would agree this is a good rule, and we ask for their support.

Without looking at any blame, why do we need? I think, instead, of the Washington Post says we need a goal for a balanced budget, that the President is looking for a goal. And why do

we need it hard and fast, without blame on any side?

In the 1970's we were going to balance the budget. We were going to reduce spending for every tax dollar that comes in by 3. It was not done. Then in the 1980's they had a foolproof, they came up with a foolproof way to balance the budget. It was called Gramm-Rudman. Again, for every tax dollar that came in, we were going to cut spending by 3, or at least reduce it. That was not enforceable.

Then the famous one, when George Bush moved his lips. We were all going to reduce spending. We did not there.

I think, my colleagues, when we try and reduce spending, those are called cuts.

You know, it does not serve any of us. We are trying to reduce, in a balanced way, to balance the budget. I think we need a hard, firm commitment out of this Congress because it is primarily with Congress that those come from, and with the President, that we need to balance the budget.

He said we could do it in 5. He also said we can do it in 7. And all we would like is a commitment to do it in 7.

I ask you to vote for the rule because I think it is a good rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

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

Let us talk about this rule. Why do we need a rule now today that allows them to waive everything, run everything through here without notice, no layover, no anything? Why? Because it is now 59 days after the fiscal year came and went, and you have all seen the charts of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Gingrich Republicans did not get their work done. We have heard a lot this week about airplane rides and why they did not get it done and who felt bad and what the President did.

But, basically it is very interesting to me that the reason we are 59 days and still have not gotten the work done is there is a huge disagreement between Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the House. So I do not really care whether they got to talk to the President or not.

I am amazed that the Leader DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH can sit next to each other for 25 hours on a plane, they still did not get it worked out. We still have not got the charts filled.

So now we have to have this rule to run everything through. Everybody is trying to be obscure by saying we are for a balanced budget, no, we are, we want 7 years, no, 5 years, 10 years, the President.

Here is the Republican balanced budget. It is simple. They have got more weapons and half the special interests. That is what it was, big corporate tax cuts, big corporate welfare and more for defense than the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for.

You have got to pay for a balanced budget somehow. Many of us have already voted for a 7-year balanced budget. That is not really at issue. The issue is how you get to the balanced budget.

But that is not the issue today. The issue is how do you get the bills done? How do you get the work product done? We have failed in doing our work. But what we have done is throw other people out of work that want to do their work.

There is something nuts about this, and I must say to the other side it does not look efficient, and I am ashamed we have to be here on this rule today.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in regards to the preceding speaker, it is her kind of math, frankly, we have gotten a problem with. It has been 49 days since the end of the fiscal year, not 59 days.

Second of all, Mr. speaker, I would like to finish my comments. The other comment I would like to make is, as I recall the previous Speaker's statements from earlier in the year, the criticism to this side of the aisle is we are going too fast, you are going too fast, slow it down. I think both sides of the aisle can work on this. Let us get it completed and get a commitment from the President to balance the budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

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

Contrary to what many people may believe, this happens on occasion in our democracy where we come to an impasse. I think 7, 8, 9, 10 times since 1980 we have had debates about where to take the country. We have had to go past the end of the fiscal year.

This is probably the greatest debate I will ever engage in as a Member of Congress because the single issue is this: Is it not about time, American people, both Houses of Congress and the President joined together and commit to the principle of balancing the budget within 7 years, which is not too hard, which needs to be done?

Let me tell you why it needs to be done: We spent more money this year in interest payments than the entire Department of Defense budget. If we do not change our spending ways, in 17 years the entitlement portion of the budget and the interest portion of the budget will consume the entire revenue stream. If we do not do it now, when are we going to do it? Let some objective group, not Republicans or Democrats, look at the numbers. This can end in 30 seconds, not just for veterans and Social Security applicants but for the whole Nation. Let us end it right. Let us give the American people the best Christmas present they could ever have, and that is Congress and the President agree to get the Nation's financial house in order. Now is the time.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, with today's continuing resolution, I am glad the Republican leadership has finally recognized what Democrats have felt.

By this resolution, I am glad the Republican leadership has recognized what we felt all along, and that is that it is wrong to use veterans and Medicare recipients and social security recipients as hostages, as innocent victims in this budget debate.

It is not what is in this continuing resolution today that bothers me. It is what is not in this continuing resolution that bothers me. The resolution we will vote on today does not allow us to ensure that the paychecks of the American military personnel will go out on time on December 1. Let me repeat that: The continuing resolution today will not ensure that American military paychecks will go out on time on December 1. As we sit in this comfortable, heated room, there are thousands of American soldiers serving in the freezing cold of Korea, and under our continuing resolution today, those soldiers' families may not get their paychecks on December 1 and they may not be able to pay their rent and their utility bills.

My friends, that is unconscionable, and we should not allow it to happen. I am honored and privileged to represent 45,000 soldiers at Fort Hood in Texas. They are patriotic young men and women doing their duty, doing what we have asked them to do to serve their country, and it is unfair and it wrong. Under this resolution, even if it passes, we cannot tell them eye to eye that they are going to get their paychecks on time.

There is nothing wrong with having an honest budget debate about whether we balance the budget in 7 years, 8 years, 9 years.

There is nothing wrong about having that debate. It is wrong not to pay our military personnel on time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman just in the well, I would like to report to him without any reference to Medicare, Medicaid, school lunches, tax increases, tax cuts, or anything else, the House and the Senate, in a strong bipartisan vote, have already passed the bill, the Defense appropriations bill, that would pay the salaries of the people in our military. All we need is a signature from the President, and that becomes law and they can go back to work and they can get paid.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this morning and we hear on the

radio waves and in the newspapers people are sick and tired. They are tired of the quibbling. They are tired of the Government being shut down. They want us to do our business.

Let me just say to my colleagues and, through them, to the American people, yes, democracy is a messy business.

As George Will said the other day, there is no such tension, there is no such disagreement going on in Beijing and Havana, that none of us are envious of that. It is messy.

What we are doing is important because there is an underlying principle that is important here, and the underlying principle is a balanced budget.

As we have heard, this is a reasonable balanced budget. Medicare is up by 40 percent per individual over the next 7 years. Medicaid is up by nearly 50 percent; more student loans; the earned-income tax credit is up. If that is the case, what is this all about? It is about slowing the rate of government growth so we can just live within our means, and that will mean lower interest rates so everybody with a mortgage or a car loan or business loan can spend less money on that and have more money to spend and invest in their business and to spend on their family.

Yes, it is messy, but it is important, and we should balance the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply point out the gentleman from Florida is incorrect. The military pay raise cannot go into effect until the authorization level is passed, and that legislation is tied up between the two Houses. So the military personnel will not get their pay raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, do we all remember that game show, "Name That Tune"? I can name that tune in 10 notes, I can name that tune in 7 notes.

The American people think that is what we are doing here with this 7 years. I can balance that budget in 7 years, I can balance that budget in 5 years, I can balance that budget. The 7 years is arbitrary. A dozen Members on that side have told me the 7 years is arbitrary.

It is reported that, when asked publicly by the press how we arrived at 7 years, the Speaker of the House said it was our intuition.

This is not a game show. Name That Tune is not about doubling the Medicare premiums on my senior citizens in Montana. Name That Tune is not worth cutting 600 little Montana kids out of Head Start. Name That Tune is not worth increasing the costs of college as much as \$9,000 to my Montana students.

No wonder the American people do not support this fight. They understand that this thing was intuition. They understand that the 7 years is arbitrary.

What the American people support is moving toward a balanced budget in whatever number of years it takes to preserve the appropriate 50-year tradition of an equitable Federal partnership in their lives. There is no magic about 7 or 10. Let us get off of Name That Tune and start naming that balanced budget in a way that protects the American people as well as the American economy.

□ 1200

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, communications are very important in this discussion. We have got to remember communications, both now and after we finish with our work.

What I am talking about is the fact that we are spending so much time tearing away from tradition and tearing away from 30 years of practice and indulgence, spending that has been on in this Government to an excess. And, as we tear it away, we are also getting into a lot of arguments and discussions and so forth. But we have got to admit that the people who have been in control could give us more cooperation.

We have to admit that the information that we could get from the people who have been in authority for all these years would be very helpful. But right now they are not only not giving us that information, but they are causing us to have to withstand emotional arguments.

What I am pleading with you all to do is for us to keep the lines of communications going. We are going to make mistakes. In this environment we are going to make mistakes. We are trying to bring spending cuts to our country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, this is the first Saturday that the 104th Congress has been in session. Last year at this time Congress was home with their families preparing for the Thanksgiving holidays, praying for peace in Bosnia and the Middle East. We had adopted all 13 appropriations bills, we had passed the budget, and we created a \$500 billion deficit reduction package.

Look at this year. We have more days in session, more votes cast, and less done, than any time in recent history. The delay, the fight, is not necessary. Just in the beginning of October, this House passed a continuing resolution by a voice vote, so uncontroversial nobody even wanted to have to debate it.

You have the power, Mr. Speaker, you have the votes, Mr. Speaker, you have celebrated the expedience in which you could pass the Contract With America. You have made promises and less progress. You can bring

the Federal workers back to their jobs and send Congress home to their families without any debate.

Pass a clean resolution. You have shown it could be done in October. It certainly should be done this late in November.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the rule, and I also rise today to say enough. It is time for this House and the White House to stop the partisan bickering that has brought this city and this Nation to crisis.

This week, how many lives were altered in ways that we will never begin to know? This week, for example, how many scientists were kept from their labs at NIH, kept from their research on AIDS, cancer research, breast cancer research, prostate cancer research?

All across this region and country Federal employees who want to work have been furloughed. Those who have been working have been struggling to keep their agencies afloat and thousands, of taxpayers have been locked out of services they need and deserve. Federal employees, Federal contractors, and the American people have become pawns and hostages in a showdown that can and must be resolved.

The situation, frankly, has become intolerable, and, quite frankly, shameful. I would like to include a letter from the suburban Maryland High Technology Council outlining the adverse effects and impact, because frankly, I know there is common ground for agreement and for ending this crisis, and we will agree we must make sacrifices to balance the budget. We are willing to do it, and we can sit down to do it.

I want to remind the President and this body that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget is the former director of the Congressional Budget Office. So why can we not come together?

I urge this body to be involved with the White House in prompt action. It is time to stop toying with the lives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

SUBURBAN MARYLAND HIGH
TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL,
Rockville, MD, November 17, 1995.

Hon. CONSTANCE MORELLA,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MORELLA: The Suburban Maryland High Technology Council has polled its member technology firms concerning the affects and impacts of the current Federal Government shutdown on their day to day operations.

I have assembled and categorized some of the responses into the points below to let you know how this action is affecting them.

BUSINESS LOSS

Several companies mentioned that they are loosing business:

Unable to make sales.

Unable to take orders.

Cannot make deliveries.

Cannot bill the government for services and equipment ordered.

Delay on receiving payments from government agencies which affects cash flow.

Other companies comments:

Delay in shipments of perishable medical products to government facilities.

"Our firm Handles government facilities and our business definitely suffering."

"Our orders are down 80% from NIH."

CONTRACTS

New contracts are not being issued or processed.

Contracts are being delayed.

AGENCY ACCESS

Difficulty in contacting the Commerce Department, therefore difficulties in conducting international business.

Limited access to information at Federal Communications Commission.

Cannot use NIH Library—day or night.

COMPANY EMPLOYEES

Employees assigned to government facilities have no work and will have to be laid off if the shutdown continues.

Had to find alternative work within the company for several contract employees deemed "non-essential" by the government.

Furloughed 12 people on one contract, (80% of the contract staff). They represent 10% of the companies employees.

Ten people had to be furloughed. That is a loss of income for these employees and they will not be paid as government employees expected to be.

Will continue to keep our employees even if we must borrow money and pay interest on it. This will affect our revenues.

OTHER

Federal Government shutdown sends the wrong message to the world about the prowess of the United States of America.

Not only are the many government employees in our area impacted negatively by the shutdown of the federal government but our many government contractors are also feeling the drain. Unfortunately, there will be no provisions for retroactive compensation for the losses these firms are experiencing. Maryland has a large share of the nations government contractors. Lack of income, contracts, employee layoffs will have in immediate effect on these firms. Additionally the lack of indirect and induced revenues generated by these firms will have an affect on State's economy.

We urge you to work diligently and quickly to solve this detrimental shutdown of our federal government.

Sincerely,

DYAN BRASINGTON,
President.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would include for the RECORD an article by Eric Black of the Minneapolis-St. Paul Star Tribune. It is an explanation on the whole CBO-OMB controversy.

[Washington Times—Nov. 18, 1995]

'93 WORDS RETURN TO HAUNT CLINTON

(By Eric Black)

In four forgotten paragraphs of a 1993 speech, President Clinton delivered a devastating critique of the position he is defending today.

The Republican congressional leadership has insisted that, as part of a stopgap funding bill, Mr. Clinton must accept a set of economic projections developed by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) as the common

method of analyzing competing budget proposals.

Mr. Clinton insists on using more optimistic economic forecasts by his own Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a practice he derided in the 1993 speech, saying it provided both parties with "greater elbow room for irresponsibility."

In a joint session of Congress on Feb. 17, 1993, when he unveiled his first budget plan, Mr. Clinton made the following points:

Republicans and Democrats cannot have a clear debate about spending, taxing and deficit-reduction priorities unless they first agree on a common method for scoring the impact of their competing proposals on future deficits.

The CBO should be the source of that common method because it is "independent" and its estimates have been more conservative and more accurate than the OMB estimates, which often seemed to be tailored to the political needs of the president.

Mr. Clinton particularly wanted to avoid relying on more optimistic projections so that "no one could say I was estimating my way out of the difficulty."

The American people cannot follow the argument over spending priorities and will not "think we're shooting straight with them" unless the president and Congress agree on a common set of economic assumptions.

All four arguments are now being made by the Republican congressional leaders. Now, Mr. Clinton rejects the arguments that he made in 1993.

The Republicans are no models of consistency in this matter. When Mr. Clinton first boasted that his deficit projections were more credible because they were based on "the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office," the derisive laughter from the Republican side of the aisle was so loud it caused Mr. Clinton to depart from his text.

Then, of course, Congress had a Democratic majority and the CBO leaders were Democratic appointees. Speaker Newt Gingrich, who had often accused longtime CBO Director Robert Reischauer of pro-Democrat bias, insisted on changing CBO directors.

The argument over how to "score" budget proposals, while highly technical in nature, is also enormously important. To say what next year's federal deficit might be, even if all current policies were maintained, would require an accurate forecast of economic growth rate, unemployment, inflation, interest rates, wage trends, tax compliance and countless other figures.

If someone proposed a change, such as lower capital gains taxes or new HMO-type options for Medicare, the scorekeepers would have to estimate how many people would see long-held assets to take advantage of the lower tax rate, how many seniors would choose the HMO option and how much less it might cost the government to insure them that way.

Mr. Clinton was right in 1993 when he said that CBO projections had been more accurate than OMB projections during the Reagan and Bush years. The bad news is that even the more pessimistic CBO projections turned out to be overly optimistic for every one of those 12 years.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important, first of all, to remember that this rule came out of the Committee on Rules unanimously on a voice vote. There is no reason that we should not pass this rule here today.

Second of all, I think it is important we put it in its proper perspective. We

think that it is especially important at this point in time in our history for the President of this country to go along with the U.S. Congress and commit to balancing the budget of this country in a seven-year period of time, using the CBO numbers.

We do not think that is too much to ask of the President, and the President should not think it is too much to ask of the Congress, and, frankly, the people of America are demanding we balance our budget.

The next thing I think is important to point out is at the beginning of this session when we are trying to change things, it has been 40 years, we were criticized for going too fast. Now, ironically, today we are being criticized for going too slow.

Finally, I would ask all the members to keep in mind the President's budget that he submitted went down 99 to 0 in February. Not even one Democrat in the U.S. Senate supported that budget.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

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. OBEY. 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 the provisions of 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 Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 169, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 817]

YEAS—247

Allard	Buyer	DeLay
Archer	Callahan	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Calvert	Dickey
Bachus	Camp	Doolittle
Baesler	Canady	Dreier
Baker (CA)	Castle	Duncan
Ballenger	Chabot	Dunn
Barr	Chambliss	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Christensen	Emerson
Barton	Chrysler	English
Bass	Clement	Ensign
Bateman	Clinger	Everett
Bereuter	Coble	Fawell
Bevill	Coburn	Fields (TX)
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	Flanagan
Bilirakis	Combest	Foley
Bliley	Condit	Forbes
Blute	Cooley	Fowler
Boehlert	Costello	Fox
Boehner	Cox	Franks (CT)
Bonilla	Cramer	Franks (NJ)
Bono	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Browder	Crapo	Frisa
Brownback	Creameans	Funderburk
Bryant (TN)	Cubin	Gallegly
Bunn	Cunningham	Ganske
Bunning	Danner	Gekas
Burr	Davis	Geren
Burton	Deal	

Gilchrest	Lipinski	Sanford
Gillmor	Livingston	Saxton
Gilman	LoBiondo	Scarborough
Goodlatte	Longley	Schaefer
Goodling	Lucas	Schiff
Goss	Luther	Seastrand
Graham	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Greenwood	Martini	Shadegg
Gunderson	McCollum	Shaw
Gutknecht	McDade	Shays
Hancock	McHugh	Shuster
Hansen	McInnis	Skeen
Hastert	McIntosh	Skelton
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Hayworth	Metcalf	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Heineman	Mica	Smith (WA)
Herger	Miller (FL)	Solomon
Hilleary	Minge	Souder
Hobson	Molnari	Spence
Hoekstra	Montgomery	Stearns
Hoke	Moorhead	Stenholm
Horn	Morella	Stockman
Hostettler	Myers	Stump
Houghton	Myrick	Talent
Hunter	Nethercutt	Tate
Hutchinson	Ney	Tauzin
Hyde	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Inglis	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Istook	Orton	Thomas
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Parker	Tiahrt
Jones	Paxon	Torkildsen
Kasich	Peterson (MN)	Trafficant
Kelly	Petri	Upton
Kim	Pombo	Vucanovich
King	Porter	Waldholtz
Kingston	Portman	Walker
Klug	Poshard	Walsh
Knollenberg	Quillen	Wamp
Kolbe	Quinn	Watts (OK)
LaHood	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Largent	Ramstad	Weller
Latham	Regula	White
LaTourette	Riggs	Whitfield
Laughlin	Roberts	Wicker
Lazio	Rogers	Wolf
Leach	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Roth	Zeliff
Lightfoot	Roukema	Zimmer
Lincoln	Royce	
Linder	Salmon	

NAYS—169

Abercrombie	Farr	Lofgren
Ackerman	Fattah	Lowey
Andrews	Fazio	Maloney
Baldacci	Filner	Manton
Barcia	Flake	Markey
Barrett (WI)	Foglietta	Martinez
Becerra	Ford	Mascara
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bentsen	Frost	McCarthy
Berman	Furse	McHale
Bishop	Gejdenson	McKinney
Bonior	Gephardt	McNulty
Borski	Gibbons	Meehan
Boucher	Gonzalez	Meek
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Menendez
Brown (FL)	Green	Mfume
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Miller (CA)
Bryant (TX)	Hall (OH)	Mink
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Moakley
Chapman	Hamilton	Mollohan
Clay	Harman	Moran
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Clyburn	Hefner	Nadler
Coleman	Hilliard	Neal
Collins (IL)	Hinchey	Oberstar
Collins (MI)	Holden	Obey
Conyers	Hoyer	Olver
Coyne	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
de la Garza	Jefferson	Owens
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Dellums	Johnston	Payne (NJ)
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Payne (VA)
Dicks	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dingell	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (FL)
Dixon	Kennedy (RI)	Pickett
Doggett	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Dooley	Kildee	Rahall
Doyle	Klecza	Rangel
Durbin	Klink	Reed
Edwards	LaFalce	Richardson
Engel	Lantos	Rivers
Eshoo	Levin	Roemer
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Rose

Roybal-Allard	Stark	Vento
Rush	Stokes	Visclosky
Sabo	Studds	Ward
Sanders	Stupak	Waters
Sawyer	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Schroeder	Tejeda	Williams
Schumer	Thompson	Wise
Scott	Thornton	Woolsey
Serrano	Thurman	Wyden
Sisisky	Torres	Wynn
Skaggs	Torricelli	Yates
Slaughter	Towns	
Spratt	Velazquez	

NOT VOTING—16

Baker (LA)	McCrery	Volkmer
Brewster	McDermott	Waxman
Dornan	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Oxley	Wilson
Hayes	Pryce	
Jacobs	Tucker	

□ 1226

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

Mr. POSHARD, Ms. DANNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BROWDER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2491, 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-354) on the resolution (H. Res. 379) providing for the consideration of a Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 275, the Chair wishes to announce that today the Chair will entertain a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 123.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. McINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-355) on the resolution (H. Res. 280) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and

Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1230

CONCURRING IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 279 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 279

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or his designee to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is based on an inability to get an answer yesterday. Is the measure before the House the same measure which excludes the cost-of-living increases for military retirees for fiscal year 1996, 1997, and 1998, under the national security provisions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to the content of a measure that the resolution before the House would make in order.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order, Mr. Speaker, at a time when proponents and opponents of the measure have time, to ask the proponents to yield to such a question? Would that be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be in order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILENSEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for the purposes 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, the rule provides for the consideration of a mo-

tion by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to concur in the Senate amendment to the Balanced Budget Act. This rule is made necessary by the fact that two small provisions of the Balanced Budget Act were stricken from the legislation as a result of the so-called Byrd rule.

Mr. Speaker, business as usual in Washington is making promises, not keeping them. Business as usual is talking about a balanced budget, but not passing one. Business as usual is higher taxes on families and more spending on Government.

By each of these three criteria, Mr. Speaker, passing the Balanced Budget Act today and sending it to the President is not business as usual.

Instead, this is a truly historic day in congressional history, the day when Congress agrees on a budget plan that places children and tomorrow ahead of politicians. That day is today. This rule will permit us to vote on a real plan, a specific plan that balances the budget in 7 years. It may not be perfect, but it has the support of a majority in the House and Senate. It has the support of those who want larger tax cuts, and those who would rather increase spending a little more. It has supporters who want to balance the budget more rapidly and those who think 7 years is as fast as possible.

Mr. Speaker, because it is a real plan rather than some phony outline, crafting the Balanced Budget Act involved real choices and very tough decisions. The conventional wisdom was that a final package could not be put together. The majorities in the House and Senate would self-destruct, many had said. That was obviously not the case.

Along with tremendous leadership from a number of people in and out of Congress, those who support this bill have come together behind a belief that it is a moral imperative that we put children ahead of politics as usual.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that balancing the budget is critical to improving standards of living. Lower interest rates from this bill alone are expected to create nearly 500,000 new jobs, private sector jobs in my State of California alone. Cutting the top rate on capital gains and extending the research tax credit will translate directly into more jobs in the companies that are at the heart of my State's transition from a defense-based to an export-based economy.

Mr. Speaker, I know the experience of these new jobs to families in California. I will not apologize for cutting taxes to create more private sector jobs. These growth incentives will also increase wage levels, addressing the problem of stagnant wages that has plagued the economic recovery during the past 3 years. While we balance the Federal budget, we must be sure that clear priorities are addressed. Past Congresses have ignored the cost of failed immigration policies. Billions of