

(22.9%) including two individuals who hold permanent work visas and who prior to employment with my office, applied for U.S. citizenship, and two military reservists.

In addition, let me assure you that I am the employing authority for the Offices of the Clerk. I personally determine the hiring and other personnel actions that are taken in my offices. All references that either the Committee on House Oversight, Leadership Offices or others determine my personnel decisions are untrue and I find personally insulting. I made these and other personnel decisions and will not hide behind someone's political agenda to suggest otherwise. Further, I believe it is a stretch to be criticized for "wholesale" termination of individuals employed prior to the 104th Congress. After these nine actions, 168 professionals are employed by the Clerk, in addition to 66 House Page positions. Of these 168 employees, 133 are holdovers from the Democrat-controlled 103rd Congress. Therefore, 80 percent of the Clerk's current employees are holdovers from the 103rd Congress.

Also, as I explained to you earlier, in the reorganization of the Clerk's offices as I proposed to the Committee on House Oversight and as it was approved, all positions were abolished effective June 30, 1995, and new standardized positions created effective July 1, 1995. All employees who were retained within the Clerk's organization were re-assigned to these new standardized positions and this re-assignment may have resulted in increases or decreases in pay. While these nine employees were retained at that time, none of the employees received merit raises or promotions.

Between November 30 and December 7, all nine employees were informed that they were going to be placed on administrative leave from their notification date forward until January 16-22 days after Christmas and more than five weeks advance notice before their removal from the Clerk's payroll. This voluntary action was also accompanied by my further commitment to provide lump sum payments for accrued annual leave for all of these employees for up to 30 calendar days and other help in their efforts to find alternative employment. No employee was terminated during the Christmas Holiday week as stated throughout various media reports.

Other media reports have contained statements that the released employees were "locked out" of computers prior to their notification. This statement is completely inaccurate. While changes in computer user IDs and passwords have now occurred, it came after notification of individuals of their future employment status. In fact, all employees were asked during their exit interview with the Immediate Office to complete a checkout process with my office prior to close of business Monday, December 11. This process is routine and requires the return of office keys, House equipment, parking stickers and House IDs prior to the finalization of payroll actions. A number of these released individuals have failed to meet this deadline and could jeopardize timely processing of their lump sum payments during this compressed administrative period. Any personal assistance you could provide in the retrieval of these items would be of great help.

I'd like to again state that while all these positions were contained within my reorganization proposal adopted by the Committee on House Oversight and implemented on July 1, 1995, I have yet to determine whether to fill these positions with new candidates, hold them as vacant positions or forward a proposal to CHO for their elimination.

You also raise questions regarding the personnel manual I have provided my staff on the operation of the Offices of the Clerk. The

manual clearly outlines procedures and guidelines for disciplinary actions and dismissals for cause. In no way does the manual prohibit dismissal without cause or end the category of at-will employment. In fact, contrary to various media reports, the enactment and implementation of the Congressional Accountability Act will not end at-will employment in these offices.

I know and respect your interest in the institutional aspects of Capitol Hill. Like you, I have a deep sense of obligation and responsibility to ensure the success of the House and in particular the Clerk's organization. Consequently, I have never had any interest in taking internal administrative actions that would threaten the abilities of the House. I would like to personally discuss with you again any questions or concerns you have regarding these actions and my management abilities.

Finally, I share your belief that these individuals have and could continue, in different capacities, to make positive contributions to the House. While I do not wish to further their employment with the Clerk's organization, I am not the only employing authority on Capitol Hill. I would happily recommend them for employment with you or any other Member interested in offering them new opportunities.

If you have any further inquiries, I would welcome them.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize briefly in the letter to Mr. HOYER the Clerk indicated, "These positions were contained within my reorganization proposal adopted by the Committee on House Oversight and implemented on July 1, 1995." The Clerk says, "I have yet to determine whether to fill these positions with new candidates, hold them as vacant positions, or forward a proposal to the Committee on House Oversight for their elimination."

Again, this is a business reorganization decision on the part of the Clerk.

She goes on to say, "You have also raised questions regarding the personnel manual I have provided my staff on the operation of the offices of the Clerk." The letter states, "The manual clearly outlines procedures and guidelines for disciplinary actions and dismissals for cause. In no way does the manual prohibit dismissal without cause or in the category of at-will employment. In fact, contrary to various media reports, the enactment and implementation of the Congressional Accountability Act will not end at-will employment in these offices."

Mr. Speaker, I would to on to tell you that it will not end the reorganization of this institution, and that there will be individuals who will no longer have jobs, through no fault of their own, other than the fact that this place was padded with scores of people who should never have been on the payroll in the first place, and who had jobs which did not make a lot of sense. We will continue to restructure this place until it makes sense. We will do it with as much reasonableness as we can, but we will do it.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter di-

rected to Ms. Carle dated December 13, 1995, appear immediately preceding her response, so that the record is clear.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 311.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 122, REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) setting forth a revised congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 is a closed rule providing for consideration in the House of House Concurrent Resolution 122, a revised budget resolution for fiscal years 1996 through 2002. The resolution is based on the Congressional Budget Office scoring of the most recent budget proposal of the President as laid before the Congress last Friday, December 15. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1230

The rule provides that the previous question is ordered to final adoption without intervening motion.

Now, Members, what that means is that there will not be a motion to recommit. That is consistent with the existing provision of the Budget Act, which prohibits recommitting a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, and as Members will recall, last spring I wrote to the President and offered him the opportunity to present to us an alternative 7-year balanced budget that we could make in order during consideration of the congressional budget resolution, along with other alternatives we would bring to the floor for debate. If Members will recall, all of those resolutions were balanced budgets that were brought to the floor.

At that time, we received no response from the President. By its lack of response to my request, the administration was, in my opinion, indicating that it was not interested in even trying to achieve a balanced budget within 7 years or within any other time.

Mr. Speaker, the President subsequently, later on, suggested that it might be possible to offer a balanced budget in 10 years, then maybe in 9 years, he said, then 8 years, and, finally, only recently, maybe he could do it in 7 years.

But, still, unfortunately, the President has not been willing to use Congressional Budget Office estimates as required, and this is so important for the press and for Members back in their offices, he was not willing to use Congressional Budget Office estimates as required by the law and signed by President Clinton himself as part of the continuing appropriations resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule today is to give the House an opportunity to decide whether it wants to proceed with the President's 7-year budget that is not in balance. Let me repeat that. To proceed with the President's 7-year budget that he has given us last Friday, December 15, that is not in balance, according to CBO. That is the Congressional Budget Office.

What that budget shows, when we factor in all the off-budget items, is that the President is still some \$87 billion in deficit after 7 years, compared to \$3 billion in surplus in the Balanced Budget Act recently passed by this Congress, that means both Houses, and sent to the President, and which he vetoed that bill.

Mr. Speaker, a commitment was made by both the President and the Congress to enact a 7-year balanced budget using nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates and to do so this year. There is no question about the meaning or requirements of that language that both branches have committed to by law; that the President has committed to by law. But the administration has, thus far, refused to agree to CBO estimates in bringing

their budget request into balance by fiscal year 2002.

Yesterday, the House overwhelmingly reaffirmed, by a vote of 351 to 40, its commitment to the 7-year, CBO-scored balanced budget. Today, the House will have an opportunity to decide the same question from a different angle. Today's resolution will give this House a straight up or down vote on the President's \$87 billion deficit in fiscal year 2002. That is what this vote will be all about here today on this floor.

If the House agrees that we should accept the President's priorities and estimates, then we will proceed with budget negotiations based on those assumptions. That means the President's assumptions and the President's priorities.

If the House decides to, however, stick to its guns and stick by the law, incidentally that we enacted, that says we really do want to balance the budget in 7 years, scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, then we can, hopefully, get back to the negotiating table with that clear statement of our intent. Again, that is what that vote is all about on this floor today.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot proceed to negotiate from different tables. Either we are at the CBO table or the OMB table. But the people want us to sit down again at the same table, and they want us to make sure that that table is on the level and that everything is on the level and on the table. That is what this is all about. That is what we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is sometimes difficult for the American people to follow all this talk about CBO and OMB. They have trouble even understanding what that is all about. It is more beltway talk or alphabet soup than anything else. But what they may recall, Mr. Speaker, is that the President, and Members should listen to this because it is so important, the President declared in 1993, in his first State of the Union Address, and I have it over here for Members if they want to see the actual quotations, the President said in his first State of the Union Address that we should use the more reliable numbers of the Congressional Budget Office in scoring his budget in that year. That was this President Clinton that said that.

In that address on February 17, 1993, the President asked this Congress to score his budget using, and I quote, "the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office." And he went on to say, and this is a continuation of his quote, "I will point out that the Congressional Budget Office was normally more conservative in what was going to happen and closer to the right than previous Presidents have been."

What could be more simple and honest than that admission? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was just shocked, I was aghast to hear on Sunday's TV talk show the President's Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, and he is a former chairman

of this House Committee on the Budget and former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and he tried to wiggle out of the commitment to use CBO economic estimates in scoring the President's budget proposals as required, again, by law. It is the law that we do that.

Instead, what he proposed was that somehow we should begin without using anybody's assumptions; we should proceed to negotiate a budget agreement; and then, and only then, score the agreement by some kind of negotiated compromise between CBO and OMB. That is smoke and mirrors at its worst.

Mr. Speaker, that is the most mind-boggling, mind-blowing, mind-bending suggestion that I have ever heard coming out of someone with the experience of Mr. Panetta.

The President of the United States is talking about compromising the integrity of the independent Congressional Budget Office, formerly touted by that President, which I just read my colleagues, in saying that economic projections should be a matter of political negotiations after the fact.

Members of the House, the President is coming across like the 300-pound man who has promised his wife he will lose 100 pounds by the end of the year. But when it comes to the end of the year, and he has only lost 25 pounds, he asks his wife to renegotiate the meaning of the 100 pounds so that it conforms to the 25 pounds he actually lost. That is how ridiculous this whole argument is. It is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question of a real balanced budget should be a matter that is subject to negotiation just to conform to the appetites of government and those that want to spend, spend, spend. It should, instead, conform to the American taxpayers' pocketbook, as we would like to see it, and that is in balance.

Mr. Speaker, just as a rose, is a rose, is a rose, a balanced budget, is a balanced budget, is a balanced budget. And just as a rose by any other name would still smell as sweet, an unbalanced budget by any other name would still smell rotten.

Members, is it any wonder that the American people are so fed up and holding their noses over the smells emanating from this President's attempt to portray an unbalanced budget as balanced? What could be more transparent than a gilded rose that still smells like a skunk cabbage? And do Members know what a skunk cabbage is? My friends, try smelling one one time.

Mr. Speaker, the charge was made in the Committee on Rules that this rule and this budget resolution it makes in order is political. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that we are now engaged in the political process, in a political body that is the Congress, under a political system that is established by our Constitution. Politics is about the allocation of resources,

about setting priorities, making choices. That is what this Congress is all about.

Yes, this is politics in the most honorable and defining sense of that term. We are indeed engaged in the most important political debate of our generation, over whether we are willing to put our political and financial House in order by living within our means. That is something the American people do. They expect us to do it.

This debate will define for the next generation whether we were willing to face up to that challenge of balancing the budget and providing a brighter future for our children and our grandchildren, and I have four of them, or whether we will be too cowardly to do

that and, instead, consign these people, these children of ours, and our posterity to deeper debt, stagnation and failure. We just cannot do that.

This is about politics in its finest sense of that term, the politics of making tough, hard choices. That is what we have to do if we are to balance the budget, but they are choices that will determine the future direction of this Nation and what kind of legacy we will leave to our posterity.

I urge support of this rule and defeat of the President's unbalanced budget that will be on this floor in just a few minutes so that we can get back on the course we and the President, by law, committed to, and that is achieving a truly balanced budget in the next 7

years; and getting back to a common negotiating table that is on the level with everything on it. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, Members should come over here, vote for this rule, and then defeat this unbalanced budget so that we can get on with what we have all agreed to, and that is bringing some fiscal sanity to this Government of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD, a document entitled "The Amendment Process Under Special Rules Reported By The Rules Committee, 103rd Congress v. 104th Congress (As of December 18, 1995)."

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	57	65
Modified Closed ³	49	47	20	23
Closed ⁴	9	9	11	12
Total	104	100	88	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Appropriations	PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations FY 1996 #2	PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	PO: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Appropriations FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations FY 1996	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
				A: 409-1 (7/31/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of December 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth.	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President.	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, the truth is this is not even the President's budget. It was put together by a Republican staff without consulting the White House and without consulting OMB. So let us get that matter straight.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the House of Representatives is spending time on a matter that is a complete waste of time. Today is the 10th day this year that the U.S. Government has been closed.

Today 383,000 people will be turned away from National Park Service facilities. Today 80,000 people will be turned away from the Smithsonian Institutions and the National Zoo. Today the January 1 benefit checks for 3.3 million veterans will be threatened. Today 20,000 students who apply for loans will not have their applications processed, and may not be able to pay for college.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have been in control of the Congress for almost a year.

On October 1, 10 months into their reign, the Republican Congress should have finished the 13 appropriations bills so that the Federal Government wouldn't shut down and these things wouldn't happen.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are. It's nearly Christmas and we haven't even sent all the appropriations bills to the President yet. The American people will feel it.

That's why my Republican colleagues are negotiating with the President today. That's why it's so important to keep those negotiations open instead of playing these type of political games.

This bill today is just an attempt to embarrass the President, and it is a

waste of time; and, so I said, it is a waste of time.

Last week my Republican colleagues dismissed this proposal out of hand. They refuse to reconsider their own Medicare and Medicaid cuts to pay for tax breaks for the rich. They refuse to keep their end of the contract and propose a budget that protects Medicare, education, and the environment.

So why on Earth is this out-of-date negotiating offer on the floor now? and why haven't my Republican colleagues put together their own alternative?

If Congress and the President are in the midst of negotiating then negotiate. Keep going until you get it right. The American people are getting tired of these silly political games, and I just don't blame them.

Mr. Speaker let's get a deal the House can vote on, or at least let's get the appropriations bills on the floor. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. The resolution is a waste of time, and Congress shouldn't be playing these games. Let's stop the politics and give the American people their Government back.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to respond to the gentleman's remark, in my closing remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], one of the outstanding Members of this body, and a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strong support of this rule, believing that we should, in fact, keep out promises. That is really what this comes down to, very simply and basically, Mr. Speaker.

We made a commitment on September 27, 1994, that we would move ahead with the Contract With America. Within that plan, we called for balancing the Federal budget. We all read the newspaper. We watch television. We know that there is a very low level of support right now for Republicans in the U.S. Congress. But guess what? To a Member, we have found on our side of the aisle a very strong commitment to the promise that was made. That commitment is to balance the Federal budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized for this in the past. I am going to say it again. I want to help Bill Clinton become a better President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has ridden me for saying that, and several others have.

Do my colleagues know why I want to make Bill Clinton a better President? Because he is our Commander in Chief and we only have one President at a time. I believe that we can make him a better President by helping him keep the promises that he made back in 1992 when he was a candidate.

He said that he would balance the budget within 5 years. Just a few months after he won that election, he stood right here, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said, and he said on February 17, 1993, in his state of the union message, that he wanted us to use the reliable Congressional Budget Office scoring procedure.

Mr. Speaker, he has also said time and time again that he wants to reduce the size and scope of Government. He does not want to make cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Mr. Speaker, we are doing every single one of those things. But unfortunately, unfortunately, the President is going down the road toward further deficit spending.

He is claiming that we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid when, in fact,

we all know we are bringing about a 63-percent increase in the level of spending for Medicare over the next 7 years and we are dramatically increasing Medicaid and allowing the States to have the opportunity to establish their priorities.

Unfortunately, as we look at where we are headed, the President's plan calls for deficits as far as the eye can see, and as the gentleman from New York said, \$87 billion in the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has not been talked about much as been the fact that we are putting into place an economic growth package here. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my pal from south Boston, talked about tax breaks for the rich, when in fact he knows, and even President Clinton acknowledges, that if we were to reduce the top rate on capital gains we could stimulate economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, we also know that an overwhelming majority of the benefits for reducing the top rate on capital gains goes toward working Americans. Many of the people who are categorized as rich have a low level of income the year before they take their appreciated asset; that small business, or their home, and realize it. And the year after, they are also making \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year. But the 1 year they look at this asset, they are categorized as the rich, when in fact they are working Americans who have simply been aspiring to attain the American dream: The success of a business, owning a home, and the chance to pass on to their children and grandchildren some of the benefits of their very hard work.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to reduce the top rate on capital gains, it is not a drain on the Treasury. Every single time in the history of this country that we have seen the top rate on capital gains reduced, we have seen economic growth and, yes, an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

In fact, if we were to have a 15 percent rate on capital gains, we would, over a 7-year period, see an increase of \$200 billion in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

This is a very balanced package. We should support this rule, and move forward and, in fact, defeat the President's budget. We all know that it is smoke and mirrors and it is really an abrogation of the responsibility the President was given when he was elected in 1992.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no one here thinks that anything real is going on, because it is not and that is a disgrace. It is a downright shame.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, the President and the Republican leadership in the Congress have a "slightly" different view about what budget prior-

ities ought to be, about what tax priorities ought to be, and they have reached an impasse, apparently.

So, to try to gain more brownie points politically, what is now happening is that the Republican leadership of the House is bringing a bill to the floor which they pretend is the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the President's budget. It is their own concoction, their own political concoction designed to create another vehicle by which they can rhetorically beat up on the President for a couple of hours, rather than sitting down seriously and talking about real program differences on budget negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, they also are planning later today, apparently, at least they have been, to bring up a continuing resolution to allow the Government of the District of Columbia to proceed, but not to allow the Federal Government to reopen. I also find that position ludicrous and unreal.

What we need to have happen here is for the political rhetoric to stop. What we need to have happen is for the Republican leadership of the Congress to sit down and negotiate with the President with no preconditions. What we need is for all of us to stop attacking each other rhetorically because we are not about to do anything real.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be doing something that is real. What we ought to be doing is to try to find ways to bridge differences, not to find rhetorical arguments that will expand those differences. Why should we have a closed rule on this budget to allow only this so-called President's budget to come up, when it is not even the President's budget? He is not even asking that you do it. Why should the coalition budget not be up? Why should a number of other options not be up on the floor?

All this is is a narrow political exercise that substitutes rhetoric for real action. What has happened in plain view is that the majority party has taken so much heat in the polls for their budgets which have squashed Medicare, squashed Medicaid, squashed education, that they are trying to divert attention from that.

To do that, first of all they engineer an unneeded Government shutdown, an artificially created crisis, and then they bring this joke to the floor. They should be ashamed of themselves. We have better things to do with our time than this dog and pony act.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the Committee on the Budget made a request to the Office of Management and Budget to bring their figures, to bring their budget here. They flatly refused to do it. The only way we could smoke out the President's budget is to take what he has been saying through the media.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Sanibel,

FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but in strong opposition to the underlying resolution.

Some may wonder why we are taking the time to debate this budget resolution, when it so clearly does not meet the simple test that the President signed into law just last month: A balanced budget in 2002. The reason is that people need to know the President is unwilling to come to the table with a real balanced budget proposal. It seems the only way to get through the spin zone at the White House is to force the issue—put his numbers up to the test and watch the plan fall of its own weight.

Once a majority of this House rejects the President's cooked-book numbers then maybe the President will drop his pretenses and come to the table in good faith. We've given him four chances to meet this goal: His first two budgets, including his first so-called balanced budget would have resulted in \$200 billion in deficits in 2002, according to CBO. The President's third and fourth budgets—submitted after he signed into law a commitment to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years—still come up short by some \$87 billion in the final year. This is absolutely unacceptable—to the American people, and to a bipartisan majority of this House.

Yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly in favor of balancing the budget in 7 years using real numbers: 351 Members, including a majority of the Democratic Party recognize the overwhelming need to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the President to realize that he cannot have it both ways—he must come to the table in good faith, or put at risk the future of not just our children, but—according to the bipartisan commission on entitlement and tax reform—our entire Federal safety net. I am disappointed that we have come to this exposé today, but it must be done. Support the rule; vote down the President's unbalanced budget and invite him to work realistically on accomplishing balance by 2002. Let's do what we must before 1996 arrives.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, well, we have got a big joke here today. We have got a bunch of adults acting as children. I can remember back when I was a youngster and the circus would come to town, Ringling Brothers/Barnum & Bailey. That was the "Greatest

Show on Earth." Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest show on Earth today.

It is unbelievable that we would have grown people playing games that are being played here today, knowing that the resolution that they are going to offer is not the President's budget; it is one that they made up, what they say is based on what the President proposed way back when, not today, and they are playing games. They are trying to fool the public.

Mr. Speaker, it is really just a plain old show. That is all it is, with no real purpose as far as legislators are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a legislator in the State legislature and in this Congress for 29 years. I have never, in my history, ever seen an act like this. We do not see an act this good on Broadway. I do not know why we do not sell tickets for this big show, because that is all it is.

Who is the ringmaster? Well, the Speaker is. There is no question in my mind. The Speaker has divined that this is the greatest show, and we have seen the shows that the Speaker has presented in the past.

So come one, come all. Come and visit the show, because that is all it is. At the end, this whole proposal will not hardly get a vote, if one, in this whole Congress.

So what is the purpose? The whole purpose? The purpose is they want a show. What it is is all part of a game. It is all part of the game that started not just yesterday, not a week ago, not a month ago. This game started way back in the spring when the majority decided that they were not going to pass the appropriation bills in time for September 30, so the Government would run, because they wanted to use the shutdown of the Government in order to force the President and the Democrats to accept their budget.

Mr. Speaker, one has nothing to do with the other. Appropriation bills are separate bills that should have been passed, but they did not want to. They decided that they could force the President, in order to not shut down the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the President, "Mr. President, I want to tell you, and I want to tell this House, you stand firm for your principles. I will stay with you right to the end."

When is the end? Maybe sometime next year when these people finally realize on the other side of the aisle what they have done not only to Government employees, but what they have done unmercifully, mean-spirited, radical, revolution to this country, this great country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, they say they are patriots. They are not patriots when they are willing to shut down Wall Street; when they are willing to shut down the bond market. They are not patriots when they are willing to tell investors that their money is not worth anything when they get down to the bond mar-

ket, because we could very well get there on the road we are going and the attitude that has been taken by the majority.

□ 1300

How long, Mr. President, I say, Mr. President, you stand with your principles as long as it takes until the majority realizes that you are not going to cave in to their blackmail. That is all it is, pure blackmail, pure threats. Do not cave in. I ask my Democratic friends not to cave in. Stand firm. Stand firm for our principles. If they want to ruin the country, let them ruin the country.

I would like to say one other thing. At the time that I was off from here and when my wife was ill, I used to watch the news. I did not have time to play silly games. I listened to people like Tom Brokaw and Peter Jennings and Dan Rather, read the Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, and other newsworthy newspapers.

Not one of those people know what is really going on here in this House, not a one of them. They are ignorant. I never saw such major commentators in the media with such major influence in this country, that do not realize what the majority, under NEWT GINGRICH, is planning to do to this country in order to try to force the President and the Democrat Members to accept their priorities and what they believe in.

They do not believe in compromise. The Speaker has said there is no compromise. Ask any one of them to take the tax cuts out of the bill, ask them. They will not do it. They could have a balanced budget in 7 years if they just take their tax cuts out. That is all they have to do. Then we can work through the rest of it.

Members have seen a budget. We voted on it in this House, the coalition budget. That was the best budget that has ever been offered to either one of these bodies. Yet the Republican Members say "no," they will not take it because it does not have that tax cut for the rich.

Well, folks that tells you something. It is a tax cut for the rich that they are after.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that in fact we could bring the coalition budget to the floor of the House for debate. Obviously the parties do not wish to negotiate in what is supposed to be taking place in negotiations between the House and Senate leadership and the President. It appears that they wish to negotiate the budget here on the floor of the House by bringing this particular resolution. If we are going to do that, then bring the coalition budget to the floor and

let us present it also. If we are going to negotiate here, bring all of the options to the floor of the House under an open rule without time limits and let us, all of us, stay right here in this House without recessing, without closing the doors until we battle it out and come to an agreement.

If that is what my colleagues want to do here on the floor, then open it up and let us do it. But to bring this kind of a closed rule forward, all it is is lobbying hand grenades back and forth between the Hill and the White House. It is very nonproductive, and the people in the country are getting tired of it.

Rather than lobbying grenades, if we really wanted to do something real, last night we brought a resolution to this floor to restate the parameters of the negotiations that are supposed to be taking place but are not. And we said it has to be under CBO scoring. I stood up and said, fine, but we could make this resolution better by expanding it to say, let us get the negotiations going and keep them going until there is a resolution and let us keep the Government operating while negotiations are going on in good faith.

Do Members know what happened? My colleagues in the majority objected to that addition to the resolution. They object to allowing us to bring the coalition budget to the floor, to talk about what is really a middle-of-the-road plan.

Let us decide where we are going to negotiate. If we are going to negotiate in S. 207 with the President, with the leaders of the House and Senate, then let them negotiate and let us stop bringing each offer to the floor to try to bash it and say what is wrong with that and criticize it. That is not the way you conduct negotiations. If you conducted negotiations that way out in the real world, you would never negotiate with anybody.

So if in fact we are going to conduct those negotiations, let us let them do their work but let us pass the resolution to help them. Let us try and find ways to come together with real solutions instead of just lobbying grenades back and forth.

I submit to my colleagues that, if we could bring the coalition budget to the floor along with all of the other budget alternatives, close the doors in this place and keep everybody in here until we come to a resolution, we could find agreement. It would be an agreement that would have bipartisan support, but that agreement would have to start from the middle of this body and move out, not from either opposite pole, and move toward the center.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I say to my good friend we have had the coalition budget on the floor. We have had the Republican alternative on the floor. The only alternative we cannot get on the floor is the President's, and that is why we have had to take his proposals, even though it is not a budget, put it in the form of a budget, and bring it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Glenwood Springs, CO [Mr. MCINNIS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is all very, very simple. The President made a deal, and the people of America expect the President to stick to his deal.

Granted, the President does not have a very good track record. I looked in the Wall Street Journal today and they have got an ad. Let me repeat what that ad says.

"Without a balanced budget, the party is over, no matter which party you are in. There are moments in history when a single choice can make the difference between vastly differing futures, one a bright future, the other a dark. We believe that you, the political leaders of this country, are now confronting such a choice in your deliberations over a plan to balance the Federal budget."

It comes back to a balanced budget. The President made that promise to the American people. All of us saw it. All of us rejoiced because this President said he would agree to a 7-year balanced budget, which surprised all of us, because, as you remember, he went to 5 to 9, 8, but he agreed in writing to a 7-year budget scored by the CBO.

Yesterday he put a bunch of children behind him, kind of as props and attacks everybody who is expecting him to keep his word.

It is very simple. Mr. President, keep your word to the American people. When you talk to those children, talk to them about Scout's honor, talk to them about the importance of keeping your word. That is what it all comes down to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the President is being maligned. That is against the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The clerk will report the words.

□ 1308

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I object to Mr. WALKER's contention to me. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] just stated on the floor the gentleman has been maligned, so that is equivalent to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will suspend. No business is in order until the Clerk has reported the words.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, somebody should have taken down the words.

Mr. MCINNIS. Order in the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will suspend.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman should not be—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House must first deal with the matter before it.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman should not be at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yesterday he puts a bunch of children behind him kind of as props and attacks everybody who is expecting him to keep his word. It is very simple. Mr. President, keep your word to the American people. When you talk to those children, talk to them about scout's honor, talk to them about the importance of keeping your word. That is what it all comes down to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, this is not an improper personal reference to the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Were not those words just read a direct statement to the President of the United States? Read them again. That is not, under the rules of the House, permitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. That was directed right at the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Not to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member should not directly address the President.

Mr. VOLKMER. They were, too. Read them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. While the Chair will remind all Members to address the Speaker, not the President, the words were not a pejorative reference to the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Did I understand you correctly, just before your last sentence, that you did indicate that the words taken down were not out of order, question No. 1; and, No. 2, question No. 2, did you make an admonition to the body not to make direct references to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair, and not to the President, and the Chair did not declare that the remarks were otherwise out of order.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is it in order to direct remarks from this floor to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members have been reminded that it is proper to direct their remarks to the Speaker and not to the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the Chair very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Prior to the distraction, we got back to the key issue here, and the key issue is we have got to reach a balanced budget. That is what the American people expect, and that is what this Congress should deliver, and in a few moments, we are going to get an opportunity to vote on the proposal the President calls a balanced budget.

I would venture to say very few Republicans are going to support that, excuse me, very few Democrats are going to support that, because they know, as we know, that his proposal will not balance the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here talking about a Republican proposal that they want to pretend is the President's budget is because what the Republicans do not want to talk about is their budget, because this may be the most unpopular budget in the history of this country because the American people have discovered over the last several months that the Republicans are set on a course which is to devastate the Medicare Program of this Nation, to remove that health care protection from our seniors, to devastate the Medicaid and abolish the Medicaid Program that provides health care to poor women and poor children of this Nation, to people who have lost their jobs, and that devastates the environment of this country by removing the environmental protections, and it devastates the education programs of this country by savaging the cuts and the support for education.

This is not the President's budget. But, again, the Republicans would rather talk about this than talk about what is in their budget. They do not want to talk about the fact that they have not kept the agreement with the President, that the budget that would come from that agreement would protect Medicare, would protect Medicaid, would protect education, and would protect the environment. They have not met that test.

So what did they do? They shut down the Government because they do not want to discuss the fact that they have failed the test to protect Medicare and Medicaid. They have not met that test.

What are they going to talk about today? They have decided they would try and talk about the President of the United States, as opposed to their budget.

They should not be let off the hook so cheaply. The fact of the matter is that not only do the Democrats reject this Republican budget, but overwhelming numbers of the American citizenry reject this budget. Why? Because they know now what it means to their families. They know what it means to the health security of their

parents and their grandparents. They know what it means to their family's health security should they lose their job.

It is the Republican budget that devastates those programs, and the Republicans do not want to talk about it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, at first glance today I thought that this was not going to be a very helpful exercise, and with some of the tone, I think that was proven right.

But let us get back to taking a lemon and let us try to make some lemonade out of it. I am on the nonnegotiating team. We have spent the last 2 weeks plus trying to get to the table and discuss the policy differences, and we have been denied that day after day after day. We have been denied the opportunity to sit down and talk about the honest policy differences.

So I look at this as an opportunity. I ask every Member of this body to oppose the previous question. Oppose the previous question and let us spend the next 3 hours discussing the coalition budget under an open rule in which any Member of this body on either side of the House can sit down and talk about what we like and dislike about the policy that has been presented by the coalition. If we defeat this previous question, we can do that, and I say in the spirit of Christmas and fairness, instead of spending the next 3 hours debating a budget which really has never been presented, which will get no votes, and that is what it should, let us spend the next 3 hours dealing with policy differences where we have some agreement on both sides of the aisle and some disagreement.

You know, this budget agreement and why we have been unable to negotiate has been painful to me because I read and re-read the President has agreed to support a 7-year balanced budget CBO scored. What he has not agreed was to present this final offer in the beginning of the negotiating process.

What the President has argued for is let us have consultation and negotiation, and that is something that I sense because I have talked to enough friends on the Republican side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that we would love to get to doing. But the rule before us does not allow that. It is not helpful, and it is not constructive. It certainly is not in keeping with the Christmas spirit.

Let us defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, we will put the coalition budget on the floor under an open rule, not a closed rule, and we can spend 3 hours of constructive discussions and see whether we might not be able to bridge some of the differences before us.

Our Government is shut down for no good reason. There is no good reason for us to have our employees out on the streets before Christmas. We cannot bring ourselves to sit down as intelligent men and women and discuss the policy differences when we have already agreed in the end there will be a balanced budget CBO scored, 7 years, that will, in fact, be passed and certified.

I ask the defeat of the previous question, and let us have a productive 3 hours of discussion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], one of the most respected Members of this body, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today we have before us Clinton IV—the President's fourth attempt this year to balance the Federal budget. Unfortunately, despite the rhetoric coming from the White House, this budget—like its three predecessors—never reaches balance.

When the President signed the last continuing resolution into law 30 days ago, he gave his word to Congress and the American people that he would work in good faith to balance the budget in 7 years using honest CBO numbers. However, since then, the White House has given very little indication that it truly wants a balanced budget.

The latest White House budget is evidence of the President's lack of commitment to balancing the budget because it once again relies on overly optimistic economic projections to balance the budget.

The Clinton administration has decided to cook the books and use accounting gimmicks to give the illusion of a balanced budget. But in reality, Clinton IV falls \$487 billion short of a balanced budget, leaving us with a deficit or \$87 billion in 2002.

Mr. Speaker, we all know there are only two ways to balance the budget. We can reduce outlays or increase revenues. In laymen's terms, that means we can either cut Federal spending or raise taxes.

Assuming the White House is working in good faith, it's my understanding the President can't find any more savings in the Federal budget beyond what is in Clinton IV.

Mr. Speaker, that's fine with me. I take the President at his word that he can't cut any more wasteful, unnecessary spending in the Federal Government's \$1.5 trillion annual budget.

I accept the fact that he can't find anymore budgetary savings by reducing the size of Government and making it more efficient.

And, I believe him and other White House officials when they say that this is the President's best attempt to balance the budget while protecting his priorities.

However, the fact still remains that the President's budget never reaches balance. And if he can't cut any more

spending, then he only has one other option—to raise taxes.

To me, this sounds an awful lot like the Clinton budget of 1993—the largest tax increase in U.S. history—the one the President said was a mistake just several weeks ago.

It appears the President wants to raise taxes \$487 billion to balance the budget in 7 years. If it is, it's time you square with the American people and admit that you can't find any more Government to cut and you'll have to raise their taxes, again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the newest, largest record-breaking tax increase in U.S. history.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I guess the question a lot of us had when we saw that this was on the calendar, what exactly or from what numbers are we working? I did not get a budget sent to my office like I got when the President first submitted his budget, nor did I get one when I saw the Republican budget like that. I retrieved from the desk of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] there a copy.

I was wondering what happened in the transportation and related provisions section, as the ranking member on that particular subcommittee. I wonder if you might be able to give me some idea about what this balanced budget proposal by the administration did to the minimum allocation program.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. There is a 2-hour general debate coming up in which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has the entire outline. We would be very glad to answer your question. The truth is that document you have there is \$87 billion out of balance in the year 2002.

Mr. COLEMAN. No, excuse me. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from New York makes that claim. But he is on the Committee on Rules. Should we not wait for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to tell us it is \$87 billion out of whack? I mean, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has all the knowledge in this arena, does he not? I understood that he, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will permit me, I understood it was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] who knew best what, where to go, to look for dollars and exactly which numbers we should be using. My understanding of that is that we have all agreed CBO, most of us have agreed, CBO is the proper place to look.

Yet I am not sure that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who is putting his pencil to this, has an accurate number at all. Certainly, the Committee on

Rules does not. You are taking the word of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] only. Is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am taking the word of the Committee on the Budget. When you look at this document, again it is \$87 billion out of whack.

Mr. COLEMAN. Reclaiming my time, because I am going to run out of time, that is not true either, I say to the gentleman from New York. You are taking the word of the Committee on the Budget. This document right here, let me point out, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, looking at this document, it says right on the top of it, and this is what is amazing about this waste of time under this rule, that we are all being put upon, "Prepared by the majority staff of the House Committee on the Budget." That means only the Republican staff prepared this. And that is what the reality of all of this is. This does not mean anything else but that.

Members, Members from the majority and the minority were probably not even party to this. Certainly not from the minority, not even the minority staff. I think that what you are asking us to do, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is ridiculous.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. The gentleman failed to read the next line of the document before. It says, "Incorporating updated Congressional Budget Office estimates." That is what is here. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], urge that we defeat the previous question, defeat the rule, bring the coalition budget to the floor under an open rule.

Folks, we have not had a President submit a balanced budget probably in my lifetime. President Reagan never came within \$100 billion. President Bush never came within \$200 billion. President Clinton has stayed more or less in that league, between \$200 billion and \$300 billion. This is nothing new, neither Democratic nor Republican.

There are folks out of work. It is a week before Christmas. We are 80 days behind on our schedule to submit a budget for next year, this year. Let us cut the nonsense out.

I know the President's budget is a nonstarter. You know it is a nonstarter.

So many of you who have come up to me privately in different places and said let us get the coalition budget on the floor, if you have some parts of it you think are too high, offer an amendment to cut it. If there are parts you think are too low, offer an amendment to increase it. Let us just come to the floor with some ground rules where we have to be at the end of the day, so we do not end up with a \$270 billion annual

operating deficit next year under the Republican budget, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], or an \$80 billion-something budget deficit in 2002 under the President's budget.

Let us fix it. We are legislators. It is a week before Christmas, and people are wondering whether or not they are going to get paid. Veterans are wondering whether or not they are going to get their checks.

Let us act like human beings. Let us act like statesmen. Let us defeat the previous question. Let us bring the coalition budget to the floor under an open rule, and let us pass a budget that the people of the United States want us to do and will be proud of us for doing.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mt. Holly, NJ [Mr. SAXTON], the vice chairman of our Joint Economic Committee.

□ 1330

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my good friend from Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR, who just explained that Presidents have not traditionally offered balanced budgets, that is what makes this Republican conference different. We offered and passed a balanced budget. Today we are here to look at the President's latest proposal. I rise in opposition to it because it will increase the national debt and it fails to provide tax incentives to create economic growth.

I believe the President's real objective is political. But sooner or later, the American people will realize that the President is not serious about a balanced budget and he is not serious about a middle-class tax cut either.

Look, economic growth is brought about through a good tax policy, and that is not a partisan issue. It is bipartisan. Jack Kennedy knew so in 1963 and he said so, and the Republicans in this House know it today as well.

Also, the President's latest budget proposals fail to balance the budget. In fact, this proposal will add \$1 trillion to the national debt. It is important that the American people know were the President is and it is important that he knows where the Congress is.

The excessive level of Federal spending is a serious drag on economic growth, and that is beyond question. According to a Joint Economic Committee study, which I will release soon, for every dollar of projected spending, the economy is reduced by 38 cents. In other words, for every \$100 billion in projected Federal spending growth, the economy will shrink by \$38 billion.

The Republican approach would reverse this process and for the first time in decades we have an opportunity to balance the budget, and it is not through this proposal.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not rocket science that is going on here; it is kind of like when you have done something that you do not want to talk about and you try to change the subject. That is exactly what my Republican colleagues are trying to do.

They have got a budget that an overwhelming majority of the American public does not like, and they do not want to talk about their budget. So they bring something to the floor that has no relevance to what is going on to all, and they try to change the subject. That is what this debate is all about. It is a waste of time.

Before I came to this body, I used to practice law, and I used to get so frustrated when we had domestic cases and the party with the money would say "I am not even going to support my children while we have got a debate going on, while we have got differences between the wife and the husband."

That is exactly what is happening in this body as we speak. We have got people out of work, the Government shut down, our children are starving, and the parties are saying "We don't care about it, because we have got a dispute going on." The people with the money, the majority party, has said we will not even give you a continuing resolution to feed the children of America while this dispute is going on, because we do not like you and we do not like your proposals.

Reject this rule and this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, in asking that we reject this rule, I want to reiterate that the proposition before us has been prepared by the majority staff. It purports to utilize Congressional Budget Office projections, and perhaps something of what the President has proposed in one form or another. But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the real agenda here today is to do the following, in the guise of balancing the budget: To actually undermine and in fact to subvert Medicare and Medicaid and to see to it that a tax giveaway goes to the very wealthy people in this country, and ultimately to privatize Social Security.

That is the real agenda, I believe, behind the whole argument about the balanced budget, because this balanced budget is nothing but an illusion. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated previously, from a copy of a letter I have from the Congressional Budget Office in 1996, the deficit under the Republican budget proposal is \$260 billion. Reject the rule and the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], an outstanding new Member.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, about 30 days ago the President joined with Congress in

agreeing to balance the budget in 7 years, using good, real numbers, CBO numbers, and for the first 3 weeks or so of that 30 days, his team sat on the bench on their hands and did nothing in this.

In the last few days of this 30 days, before the Government shutdown, they came forward with something I thought was a budget. They said it was a budget, I understood it was a budget, but it was not scored by CBO numbers. I today understand that my colleagues on the other side are saying, "This is not a budget and we do not want anything to do with it, and instead let us bring forth the coalition budget."

The coalition budget was brought forth about 2 months ago and was voted on, and the Democrats voted on their own budget there. Sixty-eight people voted for it, and 128 of their own people rejected that budget. So now they are trying to distance themselves from the President's budget and go back to the coalition budget, which they rejected soundly last October. But the President's budget falls short \$87 billion at the year 2002.

Now the current position of the President and his people is "We don't think we can do it in 7 years, and we don't want to use CBO numbers." But, know what? The American people that sent me to Washington want us to balance the budget, they want us to do it this year, and they want us to do it with good numbers, not cookbook numbers.

The results of yesterday's vote in this House indicates that most Members in this House want it done that way; 351 people voted to do it with CBO numbers in 7 years. Only 40 people voted against it. I cannot imagine 40 people voting against it.

Yesterday, the stock market, as a result of the lack of confidence in this President to balance the budget, fell 100 points.

I simply would say to this Congress and to those in Washington that Santa Claus no longer drops down from the Rotunda; that the people that sent me to Washington last year, in November of 1994, want us to send a message that Santa Claus does not live in Washington anymore, he moved to the North Pole.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure, the last speaker in the well had his metaphors wrong. It was the Easter Bunny that was supposed to pass down. You all were supposed to pass the budget back in April.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the ranking member of the Committee

on Rules for helping me to understand what we are doing this afternoon. I have got a document here that my Republican friends say is somebody's budget. I do not know what it is. It has handwritten numbers. I think the American people should really know whether we are serious. They are handwritten numbers in a document they tell me is supposed to be the President's budget.

But I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] if he would answer a question, because we need to be about the people's business. As the former chairman of this committee, if the Committee on Rules was presenting a real serious intent to balance the budget, would we put forward a budget that no one knows where it came from, with no opportunity for input, amendment, or offering of alternatives? Is that something that has likely happened to the gentleman's knowledge during the time of his tenure here.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is not the President's budget. It was put together by the Republican majority and brought out without the President's knowledge. He has not seen it. OMB has not seen it. If we are going to put out a bill to really attack the budget, we would have had one or two or three alternatives. This is not the way to do it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his wisdom and as well his knowledge.

Let me suggest that with a budget that has nothing but handwritten numbers, no prior notice to this body this is not a budget. Let me tell you what we are really fighting about, a Republican budget that denies 5 million low income elderly access to Medicare, a Republican budget that denies 1.3 million people the Medicaid they need, a Republican budget that denies 3.8 million children the Medicaid they need. What we need to do is pass a clean continuing resolution to allow a real debate on protecting Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, and education along with a Balanced Budget.

We have not been sent here to be obstructionists to keep the Government's doors closed, to burden the people working in the Government to provide services to the American people. This is a falsehood. This is a document that has handwritten numbers on it. It is not realistic.

Let us pass a clean continuing resolution, open the Government, sit down at the table of negotiation and pass a budget that the Republicans were supposed to pass in April of this year that balance the budget while protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, jobs, and the environment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Delmar, CA, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM, one of the people I admire most in this body, a former fighter pilot.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, everything that both sides are arguing about boils down to power. For 40 years the Democrats had the power to spend money out of the Federal Government, which improved their chances to get reelected. They are not handling being in the minority very well, and they are doing everything they can to get the power and the ability to spend money.

They do not want a balanced budget, because it limits their ability to get reelected. Let me give you two different ways. One, let us take a look at education. Two principles: One is the power in the Federal Government, the other is back to the people.

Let us look at the President's direct lending program. It cost \$1 billion more than sending it down to the private industries to do it. \$1 billion, and that does not even include what it costs to take the money back, because it takes seven years to find that out. But yet we turn it back to private enterprise and save \$1 billion.

We increase the amount of money going to education, but we cut out the Federal bureaucracy, the power orientation in Washington, DC. We increase Pell grants to the highest rates. We increase student loans by 50 percent. Yet the other side says you are destroying education. What we are destroying is your ability to disburse money down out of the Federal Government.

Let us look at Goals 2000. We only get about 23 cents out of every dollar back into education because of the bureaucracy. Logically, you would want to increase education by getting more money down to the people and to education. Goals 2000 at the Federal level, absolutely, we killed it out of the Federal level. We send the money back to the States. They do not have the rules, the regulations. That 7 percent of the Federal Government education budget requires over 50 percent of the rules and regulations, 75 percent of the paperwork. It is not effective to do it that way. But yet you still want the power, the power to disburse money, so you can get reelected, and that is wrong, and that is what this whole fight is about.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the former chairman.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a political exercise. It does not have anything to do with dealing with the budget or the balancing of the budget. The proposal has never been read, it has never been exposed to the light of day. My Republican colleagues know as much about the Russian budget as they know about what is in this legislation. The bill is not going to be read, this bill is not going to be heard in any

committee, there is no opportunity to amend. There is not even a motion to recommit made available under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sorry charade. Only a scoundrel would say or a fool would say that this is a fair process, and only a fool would believe that this is a fair process. This is a mechanism simply to get my Republican colleagues off the hook because they have closed down the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material for the RECORD.

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 309 TO CONSIDER THE COALITION
BUDGET UNDER AN OPEN RULE

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Upon disposition of House Concurrent Resolution 122, the House shall immediately resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider a concurrent resolution consisting of the text of the amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute numbered 1 and printed in the Congressional Record of May 16, 1995. General debate shall not exceed three hours, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent thereto. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question of its adoption.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4: Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference: Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order: Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments: Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered: The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration: 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill: 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 "Rule Defeated"	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Taizin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Taizin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. "RULE AMENDED".	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business; if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl. 7 of rule XVI and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl. 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A.
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H. Con. Res. 109				
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed: Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule: Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr).	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr).	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed: provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2()(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed: provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr of general debate.	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open; waives cl 2()(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min).	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed: makes in order three resolutions: H.R. 2770 (Dornan), H. Res. 302 (Buyer), and H. Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed: provides 2 hours of general debate in the House	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 56% restrictive; 44% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we may bring an alternative rule to the floor. The rule would make in order the coalition budget proposal under an open rule as well as any other substitute budget that Members may wish to offer.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute and 15 seconds.

□ 1345

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

Why are we here today with the President's budget? Let me just read a quote from today's newspaper.

White House press secretary Mike McCurry said Republicans would have to drop their insistence that we produce a 7-year balanced budget.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is why we are here. I just heard Members complain that the Washington Monument is closed today because the President vetoed a bill saying that we did not spend enough on it. He vetoed a bill yesterday that said we do not spend enough money on EPA.

How are we going to balance the budget? Look at this. Last year he gave us a 5-year projection of his spending budgets totaling another \$900 billion added to the deficit. This year he gave us one adding almost a trillion dollars. Ladies and gentlemen, this is

the most serious problem facing this country today. That is why we have already had the minority's coalition budget on the floor, we have already had the Republican majority budget on the floor, and now we want the President's. Let us have a vote on it, up or down.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). 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. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to provisions of clause 5, rule XV, the Chair announces 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 the passage of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 867]

YEAS—230

Allard	Creameans	Hastings (WA)
Archer	Cubin	Hayes
Armey	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bachus	Davis	Hefley
Baker (CA)	Deal	Heineman
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Herger
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Barr	Dickey	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Dornan	Hoke
Barton	Dreier	Horn
Bass	Duncan	Hostettler
Bateman	Dunn	Houghton
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Billakis	Emerson	Hyde
Bliley	English	Inglis
Blute	Ensign	Istook
Boehlert	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fawell	Jones
Bono	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Brownback	Flanagan	Kelly
Bryant (TN)	Foley	Kim
Bunn	Forbes	King
Bunning	Fowler	Kingston
Burr	Fox	Klug
Burton	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Calvert	Frisa	Largent
Camp	Funderburk	Latham
Campbell	Galleghy	LaTourette
Canady	Ganske	Laughlin
Castle	Gekas	Lazio
Chabot	Gilchrest	Leach
Chambliss	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Chenoweth	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Christensen	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Chrysler	Goodling	Linder
Coble	Goss	Livingston
Coburn	Graham	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Longley
Combest	Gunderson	Lucas
Cooley	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Cox	Hancock	Martini
Crane	Hansen	McCollum
Crapo	Hastert	McCrery

McDade Radanovich Stearns Ros-Lehtinen Scarborough Waxman Shuster Tate Watts (OK)
 McHugh Ramstad Stockman Rush Tejada Young (AK) Skeen Sken Smith (MI) Tausin Weldon (FL)
 McInnis Regula Stump Smith (NJ) Taylor (NC) Weldon (PA)
 McIntosh Riggs Talent Tiahrt Thomas Weller
 McKeon Roberts Tate Thornberry White
 Metcalf Rogers Tauzin Tiahrt Torkildsen Whitfield
 Meyers Rohrabacher Taylor (NC) Thomas Wicker
 Mica Roth Tauzin Tiahrt Torkildsen Wolf
 Miller (FL) Roukema Tiahrt Torkildsen Young (FL)
 Molinari Royce Tiahrt Torkildsen Zeliff
 Moorhead Salmon Upton Vucanovich Walker Zimmer
 Morella Sanford Upton Vucanovich Walsh
 Myers Saxton Vucanovich Wamp
 Myrick Schaefer Waldholtz
 Nethercutt Schiff Walker
 Neumann Seastrand Walsh
 Ney Sensenbrenner Wamp
 Norwood Shadegg Watts (OK)
 Nussle Shaw Weldon (FL)
 Oxley Shays Weldon (PA)
 Packard Shuster Weller
 Parker Skeen White
 Paxon Smith (MI) Whitfield
 Petri Smith (NJ) Wicker
 Pombo Smith (TX) Wolf
 Porter Smith (WA) Young (FL)
 Portman Solomon Zeliff
 Quillen Souder Zimmer
 Quinn Spence

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—15

Berman de la Garza Lantos
 Chapman Edwards Mfume
 Clinger Kaptur Pryce

Ros-Lehtinen Scarborough Waxman Shuster Tate Watts (OK)
 Rush Tejada Young (AK) Skeen Sken Smith (MI) Tausin Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 White
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wolf
 Young (FL)
 Zeliff
 Zimmer

□ 1405

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HAYES and Mr. LEWIS of California changed their votes 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. BUNN of Oregon). The question is the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 868]

AYES—229

Allard Ensign Laughlin
 Archer Everett Lazio
 Arney Ewing Leach
 Bachus Fawell Lewis (CA)
 Baker (CA) Fields (TX) Lewis (KY)
 Baker (LA) Flanagan Lightfoot
 Ballenger Foley Linder
 Barr Forbes Livingston
 Barrett (NE) Fowler LoBiondo
 Bartlett Fox Longley
 Barton Franks (CT) Lucas
 Bass Franks (NJ) Manzullo
 Bateman Frelinghuysen Martini
 Bereuter Frisa McCollum
 Bilbray Funderburk McCreery
 Bilirakis Gallegly McDade
 Bilely Ganske McHugh
 Blute Gekas McInnis
 Boehlert Gilchrist McKee
 Boehner Gillmor McKeon
 Bonilla Gilman Metcalf
 Bono Goodlatte Meyers
 Brownback Goodling Mica
 Bryant (TN) Goss Miller (FL)
 Bunn Graham Molinari
 Bunning Greenwood Moorhead
 Burr Gunderson Morella
 Burton Gutknecht Myers
 Buyer Hancock Myrick
 Callahan Hansen Nethercutt
 Calvert Hastert Neumann
 Camp Hastings (WA) Ney
 Campbell Hayes Norwood
 Canady Hayworth Nussle
 Castle Hefley Oxley
 Chabot Heineman Packard
 Chambliss Herger Parker
 Chenoweth Hilleary Paxon
 Christensen Hobson Petri
 Chrysler Hoekstra Pombo
 Coble Hoke Porter
 Coburn Horn Portman
 Collins (GA) Hostettler Quinn
 Combust Houghton Radanovich
 Cooley Hunter Ramstad
 Cox Hutchinson Regula
 Crane Hyde Riggs
 Crapo Inglis Roberts
 Cremeans Istook Rogers
 Cubin Johnson (CT) Rohrabacher
 Cunningham Johnson, Sam Roth
 Deal Jones Roukema
 DeLay Kasich Royce
 Diaz-Balart Kelly Salmon
 Moran Dickey Kim Sanford
 Doolittle King Saxton
 Dornan Kingston Schaefer
 Dreier Klug Schiff
 Duncan Knollenberg Seastrand
 Dunn Kolbe Sensenbrenner
 Ehlers LaHood Shadegg
 Ehrlich Largent Shaw
 Emerson Latham Shays
 English LaTourette

Shuster Tate Watts (OK)
 Skeen Sken Smith (MI) Tausin Weldon (FL)
 Smith (NJ) Taylor (NC) Weldon (PA)
 Smith (TX) Thomas Weller
 Smith (WA) Thornberry White
 Solomon Tiahrt Whitfield
 Souder Torkildsen Wicker
 Spence Vucanovich Wolf
 Stearns Waldholtz Young (FL)
 Stockman Walker Zeliff
 Stump Walsh Zimmer
 Talent Wamp

NOES—189

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

NOT VOTING—15

Berman Edwards Ros-Lehtinen
 Chapman Kaptur Rush
 Clinger Lantos Scarborough
 Davis Mfume Tejada
 de la Garza Pryce Young (AK)

□ 1416

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. EWING changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1655, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the community management account, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 309, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 122 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

That the Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 is hereby revised and replaced and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,114,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,162,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,214,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,291,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,354,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: —\$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: —\$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: —\$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: —\$11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: —\$17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$3,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the ap-

propriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,282,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,334,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,399,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,438,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,493,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,539,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,569,000,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,329,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,378,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,482,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,525,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,556,000,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$229,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$202,000,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$5,149,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$5,423,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$5,691,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$5,954,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$6,200,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$6,474,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$6,718,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$274,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$263,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$266,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$244,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$257,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$261,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$253,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$256,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$259,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$254,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$259,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, \$276,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$275,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$280,000,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

(6) **Agriculture (350):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.