

The conference report resolves these issues by making it clear that the authority of the State's discretion to exclude segments from scenic byways designation under 131(S) applies equally with respect to any action by the Secretary pursuant to section 1047. Accordingly, FHWA may not engage in rulemaking, or take any administrative action under either section 131(S) or section 1047, that has the effect of preempting or compromising the States' discretion. As a result, the Secretary does not have the authority to compel a State to seek the prior approval of the Secretary for its actions in this regard. Rather, the Secretary's authority is limited to a determination, after the fact, of whether a State had a reasonable basis for excluding a segment of a scenic byway consistent with its scenic byways standards to determine whether the States' action was intended solely to evade Federal protection of truly scenic noncommercial areas. In the event that the Secretary makes that determination, the State has the ability to revise or withdraw its exclusion determination.

The implementation of sections 131(S) and 1047 has been greatly complicated by the FHWA's overly expansive interpretations of its own authority. Through section 314 of the conference report, the Congress has made it clear that the discretion is vested with the States alone to exempt segments of scenic byways from the billboard prohibition and to make reasonable judgments regarding the location of billboards in those areas. The FHWA should immediately make appropriate revisions to its national scenic byway program interim policy and take other steps to reaffirm the broad authority of States' discretion under sections 131(S) and 1047.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on this legislation to designate the National Highway System.

As I look back over the legislative process that brought us to finalizing this conference agreement, I can best describe it in the words of the Grateful Dead: "What a long strange trip it's been."

I say this because this body first passed NHS designation legislation last year.

We did it more than a full year before the October 1, 1995, deadline that caused the sequestration of \$5.2 billion worth of Federal highway funds to the States. Yet, at the time, the Senate refused to conference with us.

And I say this because this year, after both bodies passed NHS bills, the conference lasted approximately 8 weeks, during which time we considered a number of strange and wondrous proposals advanced by the other body.

Meanwhile, the States have now been subjected to the loss of all Federal Interstate maintenance and NHS funds for a month and a half now.

It has been a long strange trip indeed, but that trip is now coming to an end.

We bring before the House this day a conference report that at least accomplishes the fundamental purpose of this whole exercise: the designation of a new National Highway System in this country that will be the centerpiece of the post-interstate era.

In effect, the crown jewels of America's highways.

That designation, despite the misgivings many of us have over other aspects of this

legislation, is of overriding concern in terms of national need and public interest, and causes this gentleman from West Virginia to urge the speedy enactment of this legislation.

It is true that I am no fan of repealing the national speed limit, that repeal is included in the conference agreement.

And it is true that I am deeply concerned, and have grave misgivings, over the potential adverse safety consequences of provisions of this legislation aimed at minimizing Federal regulation of delivery trucks, as well as hours of service waivers for a number of trucking sectors.

These items would not be in a bill that I crafted.

Yet, it is the majority will of both the House and Senate that these provisions be contained in this legislation. We fought our battles over them, and we fought them fairly under an open committee process and under an open rule of the House floor.

And so, as I have noted, many of us have misgivings over this legislation but all in all, it is a must-pass bill because without the designation of the NHS, the States will continue to be denied \$5.2 billion in Federal highway funds, and the Nation, as a whole, will suffer.

I commend this conference report to the House and urge its adoption.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the West Side of Manhattan, the local elected officials from New York City, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, the Porkbusters Coalition, and now the House and Senate, for the second time, have made it clear; they do not want the Federal Government to pay \$300 million to move a newly refurbished highway in my district so that the tenants of Donald Trump's proposed luxury high-rise Riverside South development will have an unobstructed view of the Hudson River.

As most of the Members of this body know by now I have been working for several years to kill the Trump-backed, \$300 million Miller Highway relocation project in my own congressional district. I am pleased to say that because of the language in this NHS conference report, any plans to use taxpayer funds for this ill-conceived project are now defunct. The language in this report takes away all remaining ISTEA funding for this porkbarrel boondoggle. I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their work in conference to ensure this project was not allowed to proceed. This is a victory for good government, but most of all, it is a victory for the American taxpayer who would have been asked to pay the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 440.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123), making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.* That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing the following projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995:

(1) All projects and activities necessary to provide for the expenses of Medicare contractors under title XVIII of the Social Security Act under the account heading "Program management" under the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) All projects and activities funded under the account heading "Limitation on administrative expenses" under the Social Security Administration.

(3) All projects and activities necessary to process and provide for veterans compensation, pension payments, dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) payments, and to provide for veterans medical care under the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act which included funding for fiscal year 1996 for the projects and activities listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 1995, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1995, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the average of the rates permitted by the action of the House or the Senate under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act which included funding for fiscal year 1996 for the projects and activities listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of October 1, 1995, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. No appropriations or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 104. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) September 30, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 106. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 105(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 109. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that all military paychecks go out on time on December 1, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, by adding the following new paragraph.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; I do not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, 30,000 young veterans did not get their GI bill checks this week to go to col-

lege. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose stated by the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield at this time.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. OBEY. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would at least let me explain what it is I am doing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First, the gentleman will state his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include language which would insert in this bill, in its proper place, the agreement on an entire CR that was offered to the Republican leadership of the Congress last night by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana reserve the right to object?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman objects.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, to permit all research projects and activities at the National Cancer Institute to continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, allowing all nursing homes safety and standards enforcement activities to continue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will describe shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to assure that America's great national parks remain open, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, by adding the following new paragraph: All activities necessary to

operate the national parks and monuments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain my objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that the motion be amended to include an amendment in the joint resolution on page 2, after line 19, allowing for the Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf to be funded so that they might not have to close in 10 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House to make a statement when we are making a unanimous-consent request? Is it regular order of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When regular order is demanded, the Chair will ask whether or not the gentleman objects or yields for that purpose.

Mr. DELAY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Am I allowed to ask for regular order on unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman is allowed to ask for regular order when there is a reservation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is a Member allowed to complete his or her unanimous-consent request before being cutoff by any other Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is up to the gentleman making the motion to suspend the rules as to whether or not he yields for that request.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, in the process of asking the unanimous-consent request, is it proper that a Member is cutoff before finishing the sentence, which is part of the unanimous consent request? When one is not making any editorial comment about the request, one is simply making the request, is it within the House rules to cut off Members from making that request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is Mr. LIVINGSTON's motion, and it is his prerogative to yield or not yield. He has

permitted all of these unanimous-consent requests to be stated and has then objected by refusing to yield. The gentleman is perfectly within his right.

Mr. EDWARDS. So they can be objected to before we finish asking the unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not have to yield at all.

REQUEST TO AMEND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
123

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one last unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, after line 19, that the resolution may be amended to allow the continuation of all projects and activities of the FBI and the Border Patrol and unemployment compensation benefits activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for the purpose requested by the gentleman?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I maintain an objection for reasons which I will state shortly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House this further continuing House Joint Resolution 123 that would provide spending authority for three important functions of our Government, while action on appropriations is proceeding.

I think that it is significant, as I am sure the gentlemen who authored the alternative motions might agree, that most of the Government has been shut down since last Tuesday; however, we are seeing significant progress. The military construction bill has been signed into law by the President. The Agriculture bill has been signed into law by the President. The Energy and water bill has been signed into law by the President. The Transportation appropriations bill has been signed into law by the President.

Today we have the agreement from the administration to sign the legislative branch appropriations bill and the

Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill.

Likewise, the House and the Senate have now sent the National Security bill down to the President for his signature or his veto, whichever comes first.

It is my great hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will sign that Defense bill, because I understand that the President has already indicated his intention to deploy as many as 25,000 troops to Bosnia.

This House went on record just yesterday saying that it has not been inclined to support that effort, yet the President says he is not only going to send those troops to Bosnia; he says that he thinks that the Congress has appropriated too much for the Defense Department.

Now, which is it, Mr. Speaker? Does the President intend to send troops to Bosnia, and if so, how does he intend to pay for them? If he does not intend to send the troops to Bosnia, how does he intend to pay for the Defense budget? And is he truly concerned about how the troops get paid?

One of the issues that has been raised by one of the gentleman who stood up at the well here a few minutes ago was his concern that the troops be paid. This Congress in both the House and the Senate has completed the National Security appropriations bill. Under that bill, all of our troops will be paid.

Now, if the President is concerned about the welfare of the troops that he intends be deployed into harm's way in Bosnia, he will sign that bill. He will sign that bill and our troops will be paid. As soon as he signs that bill, it will become law. However, if he vetoes that bill, he will be saying that not only does he intend to send troops to Bosnia to put them in harm's way, but he does not intend to pay them while they are there. Now, that is absolutely ludicrous.

So I appreciate one of the gentlemen who stood up and said that he was concerned about the welfare of the troops, but I would urge him not to waste time with motions here on the floor and go to the President of the United States and say, Mr. President, you should sign that bill, sign that national defense bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know how hard and how difficult this process has been in the last couple of weeks, but we also know how and why this has occurred. We also know that many activities of government can continue to operate under a determination that they are essential to maintaining the public health and safety, even though there is no funding authority for those activities which have not yet passed into law at this time.

This continuing resolution would remove the uncertainty of certain continued operations for several critical Government functions, and I might add, this is the first shot. This is the first rifle shot. If, in fact, the Congress and the President of the United States

cannot reach an agreement in the days ahead, there will be others, there will be other attempts to address specific functions, many of which may have been approached or suggested by the gentlemen that preceded me with those motions.

Upon the enactment of this continuing resolution, however, these activities which I will describe shortly will be removed from any involvement in the ongoing budget situation. These activities will be able to maintain smooth, effective operations, and the people working on them will be able to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution provides funding rates at the average levels of the House and Senate fiscal year 1996 regular bills until the end of the fiscal year or until the regular bill is signed into law, whichever is first, for the following items.

Let me say, the last CR that will be sent down to the President—in fact, the last two CR's that have been sent down to the President—called for a level at the lower of the House or Senate 1995 levels. This continuing resolution calls for the average of the House and Senate or the House and last year. So this is less restrictive than the continuing resolutions have been for these specific functions of Government.

First, all expenses of Medicare contractors to determine claims and to pay individuals and hospitals; second, all administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration to pay benefits and to process claims; third, all expenses to provide for veterans' compensation, pensions and medical care, including paying benefits and processing claims.

Mr. Speaker, several of these activities, the Social Security Administration and Medicare, are directly linked to trust fund activities for which the funding has already been collected, and the authority to administer these activities needs to be granted and to not involve appropriations from the general fund.

The other one, the veterans' compensation and pensions section, is an appropriated entitlement and, as such, these benefits are required by law.

These are all extremely important functions, as are some of the functions that have been detailed by the gentlemen that preceded me in their motions. These are very, very important, and they need to continue, even though we have currently found ourselves at a budget impasse.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the budget impasse can be over today. The President could sign on to a 7-year balanced budget agreement whereby the scoring of the numbers would be performed by the Congressional Budget Office. He could sign on to that today and this impasse would be over.

He has even said that he was for a 5-year balanced budget, a 10-year balanced budget, a 9-year balanced budget, a 7-year balanced budget, an 8-year balanced budget; but of course he also said

that he was not for a balanced budget at all. In fact, his most detailed presentation of a balanced budget, notwithstanding the incredibly high levy of taxes that he imposed on the American people 2 years ago, the most important detailed budget that he has provided to the people of America was last February when he gave us a budget that called for \$200 billion in deficits, this year, next year, the year after that, the year after that and as far as the eye can see.

□ 1345

The President, of course, we know, has been on all sides of this issue.

We call on him to say, OK, focus your attention, Mr. President, on a balanced budget, within 7 years, gives you plenty of time.

Let us work together toward a balanced budget, within 7 years, let us agree on it today, and the rest of this budget impasse will be totally and absolutely irrelevant and unnecessary, because we can fund all of the functions of government, not just the emergency functions, not just the most essential, not just the most important, we can fund all of Government on a glide path toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are here with this rifle shot on these very important issues because we are not so sure that is going to happen. We think the President just may not meet us halfway and may not see the opportunity to agree on a 7-year balanced budget. I cannot explain why not, because if it does not happen, we want these three functions of government funded.

When these other gentlemen stand up and talk about these other functions of government, we want them funded, too. We would like to get the whole Government funded, and the President has it within his hands and his opportunity to make sure that that happens. But if it does not happen, we will approach, we will consider each one of the other issues that were raised a little while ago.

But right now we want to handle these three issues. We want to make sure that these go into law and that the people who need the Medicare contractors to determine claims and pay individuals and hospitals, the administration expenses of the Social Security Administration to pay benefits and process claims, and the people that need veterans' compensation benefits and medical care, including benefits and processing of claims, the people that need those will get attended to without regard to this budget impasse.

I think that this is a good start toward resolving a temporary crisis in certain key areas of government. Let us pass this continuing resolution and go on to other things.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution points up the politics of what we are doing. This resolution points up that we are playing a political game and 800,000 people are not working because of that game.

Hopefully we will pass 2 bills that will put 200,000 of them back and send it down to the White House. We have been hearing on this floor that the only reason that a resolution should be passed and signed by the President is to make sure that we have a balanced budget. That is the critical issue, that is the critical issue of the day.

Guess what? This resolution is a clean resolution. Very easy to do. We ought to do it for all of Government.

The chairman says he wants to see Government, the whole Government, funded. That is what the chairman just said. I quoted it and wrote it down. I am glad to hear that and I think he does.

If you read these pages, there is not one word in here about a balanced budget. Why? Because this is not the bill on which we will establish the balanced budget, any more than a continuing appropriation for the entire Government will be. That will be on the reconciliation bill.

And guess what? That bill was pulled today. That bill was taken off the calendar today. It was supposed to be considered. That is the bill that establishes.

Not only that, we hear on the CR that we will go to December 3. But, guess what? For these objectives, which I will support and are very important for our veterans, those receiving Medicare and Social Security, they, my friends, will go to the end of the year. Is that not a nice political decision?

But very frankly private contractors who are working for Government and whose employees are out in the street are not going to get paid next week, or maybe the week thereafter.

Guess what? This goes to the end of the year. We are not arguing about any date. And guess what even further, folks? We are talking about funding levels, the lower of this, the lower of that and that is why we cannot send a CR down that the President will sign? Average of the two.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, the American public knows we are playing games and they are blaming all of us.

If we pass this continuing resolution and said do all of Government under these terms, I guarantee you the President would sign this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution. It protects the veterans' compensation and pension recipients so they will receive their checks on time, and that is 3 million veterans and survivors who have earned these checks. I wish this resolution would have included educational benefits for young veterans going to college.

Mr. Speaker, 30,000 veterans did not get their checks this last week. Thirty thousand will not get their checks next week.

I did not get the chance to even explain my unanimous-consent request; it was to protect these educational benefits so that 350,000 veterans can get their benefits for the rest of the year. They are not going to be able to stay in school, Mr. Speaker, if we do not provide funds so the VA can pay these benefits.

If there is another continuing appropriation, which I heard the chairman say may occur, I hope the GI bill checks will be included.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this resolution should have included insurance payments to survivors whose loved ones died. Three thousand five hundred of these checks were supposed to go to survivors of persons who had veterans' life insurance last week. Some of them gave a lot of their life to the service, and their survivors cannot get these benefits because the VA appropriation bill has not been signed. I hope that the next continuing appropriations will include these items.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, 11 words, 5 seconds. Eleven words, 5 seconds. Today with 11 words and 5 seconds this House could have sent a message to every military man and woman serving his or her country, whether they are in the United States or in the cold land of Korea that you will get your paycheck on December 1—five seconds it would have taken.

The words I was not allowed to say were simply to add with unanimous consent, that I had hoped would happen, all Department of Defense activities directly related to providing military pay.

That would have taken care of our military families on their December 1 paycheck.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said, quote, we should not waste time on this unanimous-consent request today on the floor of the House.

I would suggest that 5 seconds is not too much to ask to send a clear message to our military families that they are going to get their paychecks on time on December 1.

The gentleman can make a point and point the finger at the President, that

he should sign the appropriations bill. That is his right. I think the President should sign the bill.

But there are some important issues there. The B-2 bomber, the antiballistic missile defense system, issues that Republicans in this House fought over that the President has the right to consider.

All I am pleading with to the gentleman is that let us take 5 seconds today, let us not fingerpoint. I can point finger at the Republicans, you can point your finger at the President. But I am not interested in pointing fingers. I am interested in paying the military families of this country on time on December 1.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to yield to me for one comment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, I did not say that we did not have time. I just objected to the gentleman's motion because it was extraneous for the purpose for which we are here today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the chairman very much.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said that 11 words could solve this problem and he and I both share the same goal. We want these people in uniform, their families, and the civilians that work for the Department of Defense as well as the other departments to get their paycheck, because a lot of them are not going to be able to make their mortgage payments and their car payments and their insurance payments and their credit card payments and their grocery bills. It is not fair that these innocent people are caught up in this. But I want to say in all sincerity to my distinguished friend who just spoke, there are two words that can solve this problem, and solve it today, and those two words are William Clinton. Sign that bill that provides the appropriations for the Department of Defense, that was passed by this House in a strong bipartisan vote, that was passed by the Senate in a strong bipartisan vote. President Clinton ought to sign this bill.

Here is something that maybe his advisers have not told him. That nearly half of the money in the Defense appropriations bill that he wants to veto, nearly half of that money goes for salaries and housing allowances and medical care, quality of life issues for the people that serve in the military and who work as civilians for the Department of Defense. It is not all big procurement and big spending on industry. It is for the people that are ready to risk their lives to protect freedom and to protect this Nation.

If there are things in the bill that the President does not like, listen to this

closely, very closely. If the President thinks we funded items in this appropriations bill that he does not like, he can send us a rescission bill, or he can send us a reprogramming. He has plenty of room to work with the Congress, and we have tried to work with him in a bipartisan fashion on national defense.

There is nothing in this argument about Medicare or Medicaid, tax increases or tax reductions, balanced budgets or anything else other than providing for the national defense and the quality of life for those who serve in our military.

What are some of the things that the President did not ask for and he is unhappy because we included them, anyway? We gave him \$647 million to pay for the contingency in Iraq that he decided to send American troops to. We provided the money to pay for that. What is wrong with that? That is up front, that is pay-as-you-go.

Barracks repair. We provided money to repair barracks that are in tragic condition. He did not ask for it. We provided it, anyway.

Training shortfalls because of other contingencies that the President spent money on around the world. We provided the money to replace that.

Breast cancer research, we added that. He did not ask for it. But if he does not like any of these, he can send us a rescission bill.

So two words, William Clinton, will solve this problem with everything relating to the national Defense Establishment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

The fact is we have still not heard from that side of the aisle one reason why you could not have included these other items including military pay. The fact is you are insisting that in order for the military to be guaranteed they are going to be getting their pay that he ought to sign a bill which makes him spend \$7 billion more than he wanted to, which makes him buy 40 B-2s rather than the 20 the Pentagon wanted, and you are holding him hostage for that. That is nonsense.

□ 1400

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this continuing resolution. It is critical for our Nation's veterans.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care and I are vitally interested in their welfare.

The 2.2 million veterans receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities will know their checks will arrive on time when we do this today. The 308,000 widows, children, and other survivors of veterans who have died of service-connected disabilities will receive their checks on time this December when we pass this continuing reso-

lution. The 450,000 veterans who served during wartime receiving pensions will get their checks on time when we pass this resolution. It is very, very important.

It also provides that needed medical care and services will be available to our veterans and our veterans' hospitals.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the distinguished gentleman, I wish the GI bill had been included in this. I hope that can be taken care of quickly. Because that is not in here does not mean we should not go ahead and take care of these veterans.

One of the very sad chapters in this whole dispute over veterans has been the politicizing of the VA, Veterans' Administration, by the Secretary, I believe, in scaring veterans, in causing them to believe they are not going to get those checks.

There is a legal dispute as to whether or not the President could have done it. Let us make certain, let us reassure our veterans today this Congress cares about them and that we are going to ensure that they are protected.

Our veterans have already sacrificed. We need not ask them to sacrifice again. The President could have solved this easily with the stroke of his pen, I think, a very clean CR with only the commitment to the 7-year balanced budget with real numbers.

This is not a silly spat as some have suggested. This is a serious debate over serious issues confronting our country.

But let us not let those most vulnerable suffer the pain. Let us mitigate it where we can. We will do that by the passage of this CR today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds.

If you want to guarantee that pay, accept the 11 words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. That is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking Democrat on the State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the two recently passed continuing resolutions. I oppose them for fundamentally the same reason that the President is forced to be in opposition.

It is really very simple. They are not clean. Tacked on to them are requirements to negotiate upon terms that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is proposing: a 7-year balanced budget period, along with offensive economic assumptions.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that is offensive to the President, the reason that that is offensive, is because it requires cutting too deeply programs that are particularly important to the President, like cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and veterans.

With regard to the limited continuing resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, several minutes ago the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations moved a unanimous consent request that: All projects and activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Border Patrol be included. Mr. Speaker, that unanimous consent request was not accepted.

Although law enforcement agencies have been granted a general exemption from the governmentwide furlough, there are a significant number of FBI and DEA agents who are not working. According to the Department of Justice, approximately 25 percent of the FBI and the DEA personnel have been furloughed. This equates to approximately 25,000 people, Mr. Speaker, who are not currently functioning in our front-line law enforcement agencies.

The granting of this request would have enabled these people to return to work and thereby ensure that 100 percent of our law enforcement personnel would be on this job at this time.

While I am not aware, as I have indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, the law enforcement officials on the front line are not at work, we need a team out there, and it is too bad that the continuing resolution could not have included these critical functions.

Mr. OBEY. 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.

Just a few minutes ago I attempted under a unanimous consent to offer a unanimous-consent amendment that would have, within this bill, opened America's national parks. Now, I did not do that to embarrass anybody. I did not do that to embarrass our colleagues and friends on the Republican side. I did it to open America's national parks.

Today there are hundreds of thousands of citizens on vacation. They wanted to go into one of our national parks facilities. On an average day in the United States, 726,000 Americans are visiting a national park facility. Those facilities are closed. If my simple unanimous-consent request had been honored, those facilities could be opened very soon.

Some people have said to me, "Well, PAT, you are from Montana. It's snowing out there. Your parks, like Yellowstone and Glacier are closed in the winter." No, they are not. They are winter wonderlands. Yellowstone is open. Many hundreds of thousands of people go to see Yellowstone in the winter. Large parts of Glacier are open.

But there is another point along with the tourists, and that is our national parks are in trouble, and the people that take care of them have been ruled to not be all that essential in the work force. For example, we just, the Federal Government, has just brought

wolves into Yellowstone National Park. Those wolves are to be collared and monitored. That is not happening.

As Americans know, there is mineral development going on right on the perimeter of Yellowstone National Park. The National Park Service is working daily to try to protect the park. That is not happening now. These parks are threatened. They could have been included, the opening of them, in this resolution.

Again, I want to assure my colleagues I did not do it to embarrass anybody. I did it to get the national parks open, and I am sorry my Republican colleagues prevented me from opening the national parks.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. If the gentleman would remain at the podium, I would like to pose a question to him. The gentleman is aware that the Interior appropriations bill has been on the floor twice. May I inquire how the gentleman voted on the motion to recommit on both of those?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will yield, because I voted not to move the Interior bill through, I offered my unanimous-consent request today, and the gentleman objected to it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman has voted not to open the parks twice before today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And you objected to my unanimous-consent request to do it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, under this bill, veterans' checks, Social Security checks, Medicare checks will go out. That is fine.

But the important thing is this bill illustrates the game that is being played on the American public.

Because you see, this bill is what is called a clean continuing resolution. It has no conditions. It has no time limits. There is nothing but the ability to continue running these essential programs, and there is a reason for that, because they know that the outcry over these programs would be so great if those checks did not arrive that it would overwhelm them.

So, meanwhile, folks at NIH, National Institutes of Health, who are doing cancer research are not at work. Folks at NASA are not at work. The national parks are closed. The District of Columbia government is closed. The GI bill checks are not arriving, and FBI agents are not working. That is not fair. That is not right. And that is not necessary.

We should have a clean continuing resolution. The Republicans should stop playing this game, this silly charade. We can have a clean CR and put the entire Government back to work.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the chairman of the committee to

answer a question? Would the chairman of the committee, in a spirit of bipartisanship, join with me in a unanimous consent request that as of Monday morning we open up and continue the research at the National Cancer Institutes to look for cures for cancer and for AIDS? Will the gentleman agree to that unanimous-consent in this bill?

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman will not agree to the unanimous-consent at this time. However, he may at some time in the future.

Mr. DURBIN. I hope it is soon. Think about that, ladies and gentlemen.

Can we possibly be debating whether researchers at the National Cancer Institute should be on the job Monday? You know, we can count the phone calls when people call and say they are upset because they did not get their Social Security checks, they did not get their veterans' checks. It is that kind of political pressure which has resulted in this very measure that we are considering.

How can we measure the loss to this Nation if the research, the medical research which we count on to find cures for diseases to alleviate the death and suffering in America is not taking place? That is what is at stake in this debate. That is why it goes far beyond whether the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] gets an appropriate seat on Air Force One, whether or not the President has his exact language.

What we have at stake here are 700,000 Federal employees sitting home without pay while Members of Congress still receive their paychecks. That is an outrage.

What we need to hear are the voices of the American people who are sick and tired of this political charade. To think that we would even debate whether or not the researchers will come to work on Monday to proceed at the National Cancer Institute to look for cures for cancer, that is shameful.

I sincerely hope both political parties take a look in a mirror or at the image we are projecting to the United States. The political pettiness behind this debate has reached Olympic standards.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], a member of the committee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I know the gentleman is aware that the Labor-Health and Human Services bill, in which cancer research is funded, has been stifled in the Senate by the preceding speaker's party member over in the Senate. It is being filibustered by the Democrat

Party in the Senate. That is why the research bill has not gone through the House.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I am for a balanced budget by the year 2002.

But let me bring it back to something that people are concerned about around the country, and that is the pay issue. I want to read a letter that I received from Speaker GINGRICH. I want to read it slowly and also from Majority Leader BOB DOLE.

He said: "Dear Frank," and my name is FRANK.

We will be sending soon to President Clinton a bill to continue funding for the federal government through December 1, 1995. Besides providing for government services, this bill also funds federal workers' salaries.

If the President decides to veto this vital legislation to keep government operating, the possibility exists that some federal works may be furloughed. In the event that this takes place, it is our commitment that federal employees will not be punished as a direct result of the President's decision to veto funding for their salaries. Should this happen, we are committed to restoring any lost wages in a subsequent funding bill.

Again, we want to reassure you that if the President vetoes the continuing resolution and requires federal workers to be furloughed, we are committed to restoring any lost wages retroactively.

I want to say this: A promise made is a promise kept. There has been a promise made. There has been a commitment made. And we are obligated to keep it. I expect it to be kept.

I believe it will be kept because it must be kept.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. What you have just read is a letter from Speaker GINGRICH saying that every one of these employees, including all the ones that Members on your side of the aisle have said probably were really nonessential truly anyway, you are going to pay every one of them every penny they would have earned had they been on the job. And so my only question to you is: If you are going to pay them anyway, the American taxpayer has to foot the bill, why will you not let them work?

Mr. WOLF. They should be back, and I will tell the gentleman, the administration's definition of essential and nonessential really does not make any sense.

Mr. DOGGETT. That begs the question. You are paying these people not to work when they ought to be working.

□ 1415

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute and five seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, while you all were debating here all through this day, I was at my home taking care of my wife, but I was kind of following everything going on here. I heard some

Members get in this well talk about compromise and say we need to work toward a compromise. I remember the gentleman from Indiana saying that.

But during one of the votes that we had here, CNN put on a little transposition of a press conference this morning that the leader from the Senate, from Kansas, and the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, had this morning. And what did NEWT GINGRICH say about it, about the CR that we should be passing instead of this little one? No compromise. No compromise. No compromise. Those are his words, his language. That is just what he said. Senator DOLE differed a little bit. He said, "You are not speaking for me."

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that I know that why we are here today was a deliberative act on the Speaker's part to show down the government in order to try to get his budget through.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been a week. I appreciate the fact that the Speaker has committed to pay everyone who is not working, but are we committed to pay \$1 billion for no work performance? The most commonsense thing to do is to include everyone in this bill we are passing now. Put them back to work, because they are getting paid anyway. Then take the lowest of the House or the Senate or the President's budget. That is the most commonsense thing to do. We ought to start acting with commonsense.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois indicated that we should fund cancer research. I think the record should really show he voted against the CR and his President vetoed the CR that would have allowed cancer drugs for real cancer patients that are not now paid for by Medicare. It would have been breast tumors and it would have been prostate cancer. So everyone needs to understand his statements with cancer research were done for political reasons. He voted against drugs to help real research patients.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, what Speaker GINGRICH said this morning on CNN, and I watched it very carefully, he said everything was on the table except one thing, and that was that we have to have a balanced budget in 7 years scored by CBO. That is it. He did not say there was no compromise.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, not only are Government workers affected, so are those in private industry. Last night I learned that nationwide inspectors of

the Department of Defense had been pulled from various projects. That happens to include the C-17. Twenty-two world records are held by that Globemaster cargo plane.

Now, what this means is a setback in defense production. There is no question, if the President does not sign a commonsense resolution, 7 years to balance the budget and to use CBO, he will not only be putting out of work Government workers, who will be paid, he will be putting out of work union and nonunion workers who will not be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the President wake up and start thinking about the implications of his lack to come to the table and deal with this issue.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposition is what I would call the I-can't-take-the-heat amendment. What has happened, and I have turned this chart on its side so that people can see it from a little different perspective, what has happened is that so far four appropriation bills have been passed by the Congress. The White House has asked that the Congress send the additional two which are ready to be sent up to the White House up to the White House so they can sign them.

That will still leave over 80 percent of the Government unfunded on the appropriations side, not because the President did not sign any bills, but because the Congress has not sent them to him yet. I do not know how the President can be expected to sign bills that have not gotten to him yet.

Then, because of this huge performance gap in this Congress, what the Speaker and his allies are doing is saying: OK, Mr. President, because we have not done our work, we are going to see to it that these hundreds of thousands of Federal workers do not report to their jobs until you agree to blackmail, and until you agree to take our negotiating position on another piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Members on the Republican side of the aisle are feeling the heat, and so what they have done is produce what I consider to be essentially a political document. They say: Well, Social Security is a hot button, so, all right, we will let Social Security go. VA is a hot button, so we are going to let VA go. Medicare is a hot button, so we are going to let some of the activities in Medicare go.

That is, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], has said, a good political decision. But the right substantive position is to let all of those programs go, and let the entire Government function while we work out our differences on the other piece of legislation which is not even supposed to be involved in this fight.

Now, last night the President's representatives made a reasonable offer to



the Senate, and Mr. GINGRICH turned it down. Now Mr. GINGRICH and his allies are saying it is not negotiable; we must have a 7-year balanced budget, on CBO guidelines.

The President is simply saying: I would like to see a balanced budget. But if you fellows are going to insist on whacking Medicare, and if you are going to insist on whacking Medicaid, if you are going to insist on smashing opportunity for kids who are trying to go to college, and if you are going to insist on a huge tax cut, than you cannot responsibly get there in 7 years, and so we may have to talk about a different timeline.

Because of that rational difference, you are saying we are going to hold up the entire Federal Government. I think this performance has been absolutely, incredibly, incredibly disgraceful.

I would simply like to say this: When the American people voted to put you folks in charge in November, I think what they thought they were doing is that they were going to force both parties to work together. I think they thought they would end gridlock by putting both parties in charge of opposite branches of Government so that we had to work together.

Instead, what we are getting is a very different record. I will repeat what I said on the floor last week: When I chaired this committee last year, all 13 of these appropriation bills were passed on time, they were signed by the President, there was no need for a continuing resolution, not a single Government worker was held out of work.

Do you know why? Because I had a Speaker who allowed me to cross the aisle and talk to the ranking Republican and say "Let's work this out on a bipartisan basis." That is exactly what we did, and because we had a bipartisan, functioning House, we were able to get that done.

The reason that has not happened this year and we have this performance gap is that we have a different kind of Speaker. We are not going to have a different Speaker, but we had better get a different attitude out of him if this country is going to survive this petty food fight which he has started and insisted on keeping going.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed an interesting spectacle today. It was our original intention to ensure that veterans, Social Security recipients and Medicare contractors get some relief in this bill.

Now we find that the same people who opposed the Defense bill all year want to pay defense salaries. We find the same people who voted twice against the Interior bill want to open the national parks. Now we find that the same people whose political party has filibustered the Labor-Health and Human Services bill in the Senate now

want to pay for cancer research, even though they know full well that bill contains that cancer research.

I have a modest proposal here. There is no argument on the worthiness of these three items. Let us pass this bill, get these three items fully funded, and worry about the rest. If you vote against this bill, you are against putting all of these good people to work on these worthy programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 123.

The question was taken.

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.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, now voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 818]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Christensen

Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
DeLoach  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Dunbar  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr

Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gedden  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinche

Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan

Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff

Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Baker (LA)  
Brewster  
Callahan  
Dornan  
Fields (LA)  
Hayes

Jacobs  
McCrery  
McDermott  
Neumann  
Oxley  
Pryce  
Tucker  
Waxman  
Weldon (PA)  
Wilson

□ 1444

So, (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 32, nays 361, answered “present” 1, not voting 38, as follows:

## [Roll No. 819]

## YEAS—32

Barton	Hastert	Roberts
Bliley	Hostettler	Roth
Bunning	Houghton	Shuster
Burr	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Clinger	Largent	Souder
Coble	Linder	Talent
Combest	Myers	Thomas
Dreier	Nussle	Thornberry
Ehrlich	Packard	Waldholtz
Greenwood	Porter	Young (AK)
Gutknecht	Radanovich	

## NAYS—361

Abercrombie	Cooley	Gekas
Allard	Costello	Gephardt
Andrews	Cox	Geren
Archer	Coyne	Gibbons
Armey	Cramer	Gilchrest
Baessler	Crapo	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Cremeans	Gilman
Baldacci	Cubin	Gonzalez
Ballenger	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Barcia	Davis	Goodling
Barr	de la Garza	Gordon
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Goss
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Graham
Bartlett	DeLauro	Green
Bass	DeLay	Gunderson
Bateman	Dellums	Gutierrez
Becerra	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Beilenson	Dickey	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	Dicks	Hamilton
Bereuter	Dingell	Hancock
Berman	Dixon	Hansen
Bevill	Doggett	Harman
Bilbray	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Bishop	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Blute	Doyle	Hayworth
Boehner	Duncan	Hefley
Bonilla	Dunn	Hefner
Bonior	Durbin	Heineman
Bono	Edwards	Herger
Borski	Ehlers	Hilleary
Boucher	Emerson	Hilliard
Browder	Engel	Hinche
Brown (CA)	English	Hobson
Brown (FL)	Ensign	Hoekstra
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Hoke
Brownback	Evans	Holden
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Horn
Bryant (TX)	Ewing	Hoyer
Bunn	Farr	Hunter
Burton	Fattah	Hutchinson
Calvert	Fawell	Hyde
Camp	Fazio	Istook
Canady	Fields (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Filner	Jefferson
Castle	Flake	Johnson (CT)
Chabot	Flanagan	Johnson (SD)
Chambliss	Foglietta	Johnson, E. B.
Chapman	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Chenoweth	Forbes	Johnston
Christensen	Ford	Jones
Chrysler	Fox	Kanjorski
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kaptur
Clement	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Clyburn	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Coburn	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (MA)
Coleman	Frist	Kennedy (RI)
Collins (GA)	Frost	Kennelly
Collins (IL)	Funderburk	Killdeer
Collins (MI)	Furse	Kim
Condit	Gallegly	King
Conyers	Ganske	Klecza

Klink	Myrick	Sisisky
Klug	Nadler	Skaggs
Kolbe	Neal	Skeen
LaFalce	Nethercutt	Skelton
LaHood	Ney	Slaughter
Lantos	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Latham	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Obey	Smith (WA)
Lazio	Olver	Spence
Leach	Ortiz	Spratt
Levin	Orton	Stark
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Stearns
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Stenholm
Lewis (KY)	Parker	Stockman
Lightfoot	Pastor	Stokes
Lincoln	Paxon	Studds
Lipinski	Payne (NJ)	Stump
Livingston	Payne (VA)	Stupak
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Tanner
Lofgren	Peterson (FL)	Tate
Longley	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Lowe	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Lucas	Pickett	Tejeda
Luther	Pombo	Thompson
Maloney	Pomeroy	Thornton
Manton	Portman	Thurman
Manzullo	Poshard	Tiahrt
Markey	Quillen	Torkildsen
Martinez	Rahall	Torres
Martini	Ramstad	Torricelli
Mascara	Rangel	Towns
Matsui	Reed	Traficant
McCarthy	Regula	Upton
McCollum	Richardson	Velazquez
McDade	Riggs	Vento
McHale	Rivers	Visclosky
McHugh	Roemer	Volkmer
McInnis	Rogers	Vucanovich
McIntosh	Rohrabacher	Walker
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McKinney	Rose	Ward
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Meehan	Royce	Watt (NC)
Meek	Rush	Watts (OK)
Menendez	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
Metcalfe	Salmon	Weller
Meyers	Sanford	White
Mfume	Sawyer	Whitfield
Mica	Saxton	Wicker
Miller (CA)	Scarborough	Williams
Miller (FL)	Schaefer	Wise
Minge	Schiff	Wolf
Mink	Schroeder	Woolsey
Molinari	Schumer	Wyden
Mollohan	Scott	Wynn
Montgomery	Seastrand	Young (FL)
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Zeliff
Moran	Serrano	Zimmer
Morella	Shadegg	
Murtha	Shays	

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

## Buyer

## NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman	Fowler	Quinn
Bachus	Gejdenson	Roukema
Baker (LA)	Hayes	Sanders
Bilirakis	Inglis	Shaw
Boehlert	Jacobs	Solomon
Brewster	Kingston	Taylor (NC)
Callahan	Laughlin	Tucker
Clay	McCrery	Wamp
Crane	McDermott	Waxman
Danner	Moakley	Weldon (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Neumann	Wilson
Dornan	Oxley	Yates
Fields (LA)	Pryce	

## □ 1513

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. EVERETT, BRYANT of Tennessee, and BONILLA, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Messrs. KASICH, SAXTON, LAHOOD, BURTON of Indiana, JONES, and STUMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Messrs. FRANKS of Connecticut, SMITH of New Jersey, QUILLEN, DUNCAN, and HANSEN, Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, FAWELL, BARTLETT of Maryland, SHAYS, BARRETT of Nebraska, BASS, ZIMMER, ZELIFF, COOLEY, ROGERS,

and FIELDS of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## □ 2200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOSS) at 10 o'clock p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills during the recess today: H.R. 2020, H.R. 2126, and H.R. 2492.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, for the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2492. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, for the United