



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1995

No. 204—Part II

House of Representatives

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

(Continued)

□ 1445

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to break this impasse and to balance this budget now. On Medicare and every other contentious issue, it is the coalition's budget that provides the framework to do just that. Let us get back to the table, Democrats and Republicans, and let us balance this budget for the American people.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE]. The problem is that only 60-some Democrats voted for his budget that did balance.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for the President and some Democrats to say they want a balanced budget, but it is hard for them to offer a proposal to show where those cuts are coming from. I believe one of two things is going to have to happen before we break this budget impasse. One, the President is going to have to stop playing politics and do what is right for the future of this country; or, Americans are going to have to spend some hard studying time realizing how serious this overspending problem is and what it does to their future.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy politically to reduce the growth in Government. The bottom line is if we fail this time in cutting the growth of Government and balancing the budget, we are not going to do it for many years. Vote against this budget for what it is. It is politics as usual, spending and taxing and borrowing as usual.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an exercise in fun and games, Republican-style. We are just given this budget. We do not know what is in it. It is just like yesterday's irrelevant resolution. We should be doing the work of the people. We should be passing a clean continuing resolution so the Government could open, but Republicans do not want to do it.

Let us make one thing clear: It is the Republicans that have shut the Government down. There is no reason to link the continuing resolution to keep the Government open with a 7-year balanced budget. There is no reason to link it. The reason we have the Government shutdown is because the Republicans did not do their job and pass the appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year, September 30.

Let us look at the Republican budget. Medicare decimated, Medicaid decimated, all to pay for tax cuts for the rich; education, our children's future, decimated; the environment, decimated; tax increases for working families. This is the Republican budget. It is mean-spirited and it is extreme.

Let us stop playing the phony Republican shell game. That is all it is. They talk about family values. What kind of values are we giving to our children under this Republican plan? This is a farce. We should be passing a continuing resolution to keep the Government open.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has abandoned his commitment to balance the budget in 7 years. Still, after four attempts, the Clinton budget maintains a \$426 billion deficit over 7 years. Just 30 days ago the President signed a promise to the American people, and I quote, "The President and Congress shall enact leg-

islation to achieve a balanced budget no later than fiscal year 2002." The President has broken his word. Vote "no" on the President's massive \$426 billion unbalanced budget.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle keep telling the American people that we are cutting, cutting, cutting, we are going to hurt everybody. Let me give some figures. We are increasing, increasing the earned income tax credit by \$6 billion; school lunches we are increasing by \$1.7 billion; student loans by \$12 billion over the next 7 years; Medicaid we are increasing by \$38 billion, and Medicare by \$112 billion. Yet they continue to tell the American people and scare old people into believing we are cutting them.

Yet, when we bring to the floor the President's budget, they do not want to vote on it. Do Members know why they do not want to vote on it? Because they know it is not a real budget. They know it is nothing but smoke and mirrors. They know the President is not sincere. They know it is a bad budget that is bad for America, and they know that even they will vote against it. They do not want to have to vote against it.

Our budget is real. We balance the budget in 7 years. We still give a tax cut, and we increase spending for very important programs like Medicare. The Democrats should come clean.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the goal we have here, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, as I see it, is to have a balanced budget, the first one in 27 years, but we are at an impasse. We have to overcome this impasse.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H15137

If there were a plan to do it, would you be interested? Because I have a plan. Here is what we should do. The bill we have before us is not a balanced budget. Let us vote it down. Let us pass the Republican balanced budget for the first time in 27 years, but let us give President Clinton the benefit. Let us say it is his budget so we can both win here in the Capitol and at the White House.

We had Edward Demming here before he passed away, the great strategist, who said, "In the world today you have to have a win-win strategy." This would be a win-win strategy. The Democrats would win, the Republicans would win, but do you know who would be the biggest winners of all? It would be the American people, because for the first time in 27 years we would have a balanced budget.

Let us do it. Let us get over this hurdle. Let us get around this impasse. This is the way of doing it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Coalition budget, the best budget around here.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are on the floor with another meaningless bill. They had one yesterday when they tried to make the people believe that the President had not already agreed to the CBO numbers and a 7-year balanced budget. He had already done that, so that was meaningless. Today they are back again.

Nobody knows what is in this bill. They do not know, we do not know. It has not been scored. It has not been analyzed. The real negotiations start at 3 o'clock. The President has a meeting with Senator DOLE and with NEWT GINGRICH. They know it. They know that they are not accomplishing anything by being there.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the President has been to the table. He has told you he is not going to let you devastate old people. You cannot get any more money out of Medicare and Medicaid. You cannot do away with our priorities of education and environment that you agreed to. The real problem is you cannot count. You cannot save money and give away money at the same time. You have got to learn. If you want to save, you cannot have a tax cut of \$245 billion.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, what we have in front of us is our best attempt to construct the President's budget. I want to spend a few minutes talking about the Medicare portions of the President's budget, because frankly, he has probably focused on this more than most of the other provisions in the budget.

The gentlewoman from California just indicated that we cannot get any more money out of Medicare. Rather than listen to me, I would rather have Members listen to the words of a television program that ran December 12. It is called Nightline. Ted Koppel said, "Tonight Medicare, Rhetoric Versus Reality."

For one of the very few times on the national media, serious newspaper people focused on the rhetoric versus the reality in the Medicare discussion. What was said, I hope, will enlighten us. What was said on that program by an ABC reporter by the name of Chris Bury was that the Washington Post said:

The Democrats, led by the President, have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that's where the votes are.

The Democrats are demagoguing on Medicare. To substantiate that point, Nightline then discussed the fact that you have to reduce Medicare to balance the budget. In fact, they used a clip from 1993 when the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, was in front of the Committee on Ways and Means. This is what the First Lady said in front of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1993. She said:

We are talking about beginning to reduce the rate of increase in Medicare from about 11 percent to about 6 or 7 percent annually.

In fact, the Republican plan reduces it to 7.2 percent. What did the President say about the Republican plan? On October 19, on the program, a news clip of the President, he said:

On Medicare, the House is voting on a \$270 billion cut on Medicare that will eviscerate the health care system for our older Americans.

That is plain and simple demagoguing, plain and simple demagoguing.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, what was said in the program later is what I want to focus on for a minute. Uwe Rhinehardt, who is a professor at Princeton University, in fact he helped the task force on an unassigned basis, said:

The real problem is the current Medicare program cannot accommodate the baby boom after the year 2010. We need to reform Medicare.

Ted Koppel asked Mr. Glassman, who is a columnist for the Post, "Do you agree, Mr. Glassman, the problem is not the one between now and the year 2002 but the one beyond the year 2010?" The answer, "Absolutely." What is it that is going on beyond the year 2010? Guy King, an actuary for HCFA for 24 years, for 17 years the chief actuary, has now given us a picture of the world beyond 2010.

Let us take a worker who in 2010 is 22 years old. They are going to get an average wage for the time they work. In 2053 they retire at 65 years of age. Under the current law for Medicare, part B this person would pay over their lifetime into the current law Medicare, in nominal dollars are \$281,000. Under President Clinton's plan as determined by the actuary, \$280,000. What is the GOP plan, the plan that reforms Medicare? One hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$140,000) over the lifetime of that worker.

This is what this debate is about. For those people who go to work at 22 years of age in 2010 and work hard for an average wage, the President makes virtually no change from the current law, despite all of his handwringing. What Republicans do is reform Medicare. What was said on that program by all of the experts is if you do not reform Medicare, you cannot balance the budget. The President has a phony plan. He does not do what he needs to be done in the area of reforming Medicare. It is Medicare, it is demagoguery.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, this debate here this afternoon is in many ways a metaphor for what has been wrong with this session of the Congress. It is a lot of politics and very little substance. The gentleman that preceded me to the floor here just a few moments ago is alleging to convince us that he knows what is going to be going on with regard to the health care system 58 years from now, a preposterous notion.

They are claiming to balance the budget. If they really wanted to balance the budget, they would follow the rule that was laid down 3 year ago. The budget deficit today is half of what it was just 3 years ago. If they really wanted to balance the budget, the plan has been laid out. They know how to do it. We have set the pattern for them.

What you want to do, really, is to destroy the health care system for older people and for people on Medicaid. We know that. We have it in your own words. BOB DOLE was bragging that he voted against it when it was first brought to the floor here 35 years ago. Your own Speaker, speaking before the Blue Cross-Blue Shield group at your convention here in Washington just a few weeks ago, said that you did not have the nerve to attack Medicare directly, you were going to go about it circuitously, withdraw the funds and let it wither on the vine. We are wise to you. We know what you are all about.

□ 1500

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for 26 years, Republicans wandered in the minority, crying out for a balanced budget. If only we were elected the majority, we said in our Contract With America, our first action would be to balance the budget, and last November it happened. We were elected to the majority and we did exactly what we said. We passed a balanced budget and we did it without increasing taxes.

Conventional wisdom said, it cannot be done. But we knew that it was too important to our children's future not to balance the budget.

The critics, however, said the budget could not be balanced because politicians were afraid to confront the problem of explosive entitlement spending, and they said that the budget could not be balanced without increasing taxes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the new majority broke with that conventional wisdom and proved the skeptics wrong. We threw aside the politics of the past and made the tough decisions that have brought us to the brink of a balanced budget, our Nation's first since 1969.

Make no mistake: We are here today talking about a balanced budget solely because the people elected a Republican Congress. If the Congress was still controlled by the Democrats, they would still be passing tax increases and President Clinton would still be signing them. They would still be dodging reforms of entitlement and President Clinton would be there with them.

But fortunately we have another direction to choose. Republicans have defeated conventional wisdom and are bringing real change to Washington. We are now at the point where the only person standing in the way of real change and a real balanced budget today is President Clinton. This debate today tests the question of whether this President is truly committed to a balanced budget, and at this point, I can only conclude that he is not.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget strikes out on three pitches. It is not balanced, it spends more, and it taxes more. His fourth budget of the year, the one we vote on today, leaves the Nation with a deficit of \$87 billion in the year 2002.

If you like the politics of the past, if you support higher taxes, more Government spending and continued deficits for as far as the eye can see, then you will support this President's budget. If you want to break with the past, cut taxes, cut spending and bring our Nation's budget into balance for the first time in a generation, then you will vote against the President's budget and support our plan for welfare reform, cutting taxes on middle-income Americans, saving Medicare, and balancing the budget, using real numbers.

Join with me, break with the past, and bring real change to Washington, defeat the President's budget.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are debating another smoke screen to keep the American people from knowing exactly what is in the Republican budget, what that budget really does. Exactly 1 month ago today, the President and the Congress adopted by resolution a continuing resolution that said quite clearly that we were going to have a balanced budget by the year 2002, and that that balanced budget must, and I quote, "provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment," and further, quote, "will adopt tax policies to help working families."

Now, what does the budget do? Does it provide adequate funding for Medicaid? Absolutely not. It cuts Medicaid by \$133 billion, by the most recently revised figures. That takes money from long-term care, which is what provides for elders in nursing homes, people who have used all of the resources that they have available, and takes away their capacity.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

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

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the balanced budget that we are looking at today is more than just a balanced budget; it is also about its contents. On the question of welfare reform, it is time for a compromise. The President can start by stopping his campaign to demonize the Republican plan. We have bargained in good faith and we have moved dramatically in the administration's direction by putting together a reasonable welfare reform bill that the President can and should sign.

We recently sent to the President a lengthy response showing that our negotiations have produced an agreement that is complete or in substantial agreement with 85 percent of the 88 specific objections that the administration raised in October, 85 percent. How many negotiations do we enter into where the other side can win on 85 percent of the issues, and they still are not satisfied?

We provide more child care funds and more cash welfare funds than States would get under current law. These are not cuts; these are not even reductions in the rate of spending growth. The absolute increases in Federal spending above the CBO line, and spending on all of these welfare programs covered in our bill rises over 4 percent each year. Yet, despite our willingness to compromise, the administration continues to claim that is not enough and that we are harming millions of children. That is baloney.

This administration has shown no willingness to compromise, to put a

credible alternative plan on the table, and the budget we have before us today is simply proof of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President if he were here that the welfare reforms in your latest bill do not end welfare as we know it today, and the President knows that. He knows that the American people know that.

Mr. President, in the next few days, you will receive a bill that will allow you to fulfill your pledge to end the current failed welfare system. We await your decision, and the American people are watching to see whether you can be counted on to keep your word and change welfare as we know it today.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are, a week before Christmas, and almost 3 months past the beginning of the fiscal year, and we have a Government that is shut down. We are nowhere close to passing a 7-year balanced budget plan that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, and poor children. How come? How come?

Well, Speaker GINGRICH and the new majority just does not seem to be able to do their job. For sure, they have not done their job when it comes to passing the spending bills. In fact, 75 percent of nonmilitary domestic spending for this year has yet to be approved, 75 percent. And the new majority certainly has not done their job when it comes to living up to their side of the budget negotiations. They have yet to deliver a plan that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, our environment, and poor children.

Instead, the new majority is down here on the floor today fiddling, fiddling as the Nation burns. That is right. The new majority is fiddling today as crucial services for the elderly, veterans, and our national parks are cut off, and the stock market is drooping.

This Nation cannot afford another day of NEWT's dangerous games. It is time for the majority to stop fiddling, to stop fiddling around and wasting time. It is time to stop the political grandstanding. Let us reopen the Government today.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress does nothing, in 15 short years with the policies embodied in current law, every single dollar of tax revenue will go to entitlements or interest. If there is no serious reform of our budget and the policies that underlie it, in 15 years there will be no money for roads and bridges and airports, no money for education and Head Start, no money for

embassies abroad, no defense, no EPA enforcement.

We cannot allow that to happen, and yet the President's budget does nothing but deal with dollar figures. Just cutting here and cutting there will not put this Nation on a sound financial basis. We must reform the way we use our dollars. We have to reform Medicare, we have to reform welfare. This is not a budget that creates a future for our Nation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. The President and the Democrats want to save Medicare and Medicaid. Those are our priorities. The Republicans want to do that, but they want \$245 billion in tax cuts. The two things cannot be done. My colleagues, we cannot have \$245 billion in tax cuts and save Medicare and Medicaid. It is just that simple. That is what the American public needs to understand.

Forget about all of this rhetoric, forget about all of this air. The bottom line is, we need to save this for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about how this is President Clinton's budget. How can we vote for this when this is just like taking one of the old master's paintings, one of the old Dutch masters, and come up and reproduce it and say, this is a real Rembrandt or this is one of the real Dutch masters. It is not. We must know a phoney when we see it.

So we cannot do that. The real Clinton budget saves older Americans, it saves education, it saves children. We need real, honest figures. These are not real, honest figures. The Congressional Budget Office has changed this by \$135 billion, different from what it was in the beginning.

Face it, America. Come through with the figures and then help the American public save Medicare and Medicaid. We have to do it.

The resolution before us today is just like those phony paintings by the old masters that pop up every now and then. The sellers say that the painting is a Rembrandt, but the experts know that it is really just a fake. Let us face it President Clinton and the Democrats want a balanced budget in 7 years with our priorities—Medicare and Medicaid.

Well, let us get real: This is not really President Clinton's budget; it is a Republican reproduction of President Clinton's budget.

The real Clinton budget will provide Medicare and Medicaid for older Americans.

The Republicans have taken something of value and made it worthless, because they are so desperate.

They were elected to govern, but they have proven that they do not know how to govern. They can only stalemate.

They do not know how to compromise; Republicans can not pass appropriations bills on time—three of them have not even gotten to the President yet.

CHARLIE STENHOLM and the coalition and President Clinton have proven that you can balance the budget in 7 years and still maintain our compassion for the poor, and the elderly, and people in nursing homes. Republicans talk about balancing the budget with real, honest Congressional Budget Office numbers. Let me remind you that Congressional Budget Office real numbers have changed by \$135 billion. So the key is getting rid of that hallowed Republican \$245 billion tax cut.

But here we are, less than a week before Christmas, and we see this Republican reverse Robin Hood: "Take from the poor and give to the rich."

Republicans, you can balance the budget in 7 years, but you cannot provide a \$245 billion tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, defeat this phony facsimile of the Presidents budget resolution; drop that quarter-trillion dollar tax cut; and let us write real budget.

I will show you how.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCREERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here today is the latest offering of the President in the budget negotiations, and that latest offering has been scored by Congressional Budget Office, and that latest offering has been found by Congressional Budget Office not to balance the budget in the year 2002. So for those of my colleagues who are saying that we are fiddling here today, that we are doing nothing, I want to point out that it is the President who is fiddling.

The President has yet to put on the table a budget that will be in balance in the year 2002, and what we are doing here today, very frankly, is underscoring one more time that the legislative branch of this Government wants to produce, with the President's help and signature, a balanced budget in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office figures.

If my colleagues vote for this budget today, they are saying they do not want a balanced budget in the year 2002. But I suspect they do, and I suspect they will vote against it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the President, Democrats, and Republicans have all agreed to balance the budget in 7 years. That debate has been won. What are we talking about? The debate had been won that we would balance the budget in a time certain, 7 years. So why are we going through this?

We should not be in a debate about whether we balance the budget; the debate is really about how we balance the budget, who will pay and who will lose? Will there be shared pain, shared sacrifice, as we go through this process? That is what the debate is about.

This resolution that is on this floor is an insult to our intelligence and to the American people. This is not the

President's budget. My Republican colleagues took his old submission and gave their interpretation of it. It really should be a clean continuing resolution to allow the Government to go on as we serve the citizens and the Nation. While we debate how we actually balance the budget, we should let the people of this country be served well by the citizens.

This debate really is the wrong debate. We should defeat this bill not because it is the President's bill, we should defeat the bill because it is a phoney act on the part of the Republicans.

□ 1515

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget we vote on today, and I would agree with the former speaker, is insulting. It is not only a broken promise, it is a broken law.

Twenty-nine days ago the President signed into law a commitment to present a plan to balance the budget in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office numbers. Instead, he has sent us a budget that continues deficit-spending and fails to balance by at least \$87 billion in the year 2002. It is out of balance by \$87 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the President has said in speech after speech and press release after press release that he favors a balanced budget. Why does he refuse to submit one? We will negotiate a great many items in our balanced budget proposal but we cannot and will not compromise on our commitment to balance the Federal budget in 7 years with honest numbers.

Vote against the President's budget and end the policy of spend now, pay later.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here today is to talk about the comparisons between what the Republicans want to have in their budget and what the President wants.

The President has agreed to a 7-year budget using CBO numbers, but the reason we cannot come to an agreement is because of the tax cuts that the Republicans want to have before they really get to the 7-year balanced budget.

The Republican budget not only wants to provide tax cuts but they want to slow growth in, their terminology, Medicare by forcing seniors into managed care that they opposed last year in President Clinton's health care plan, raise the premiums, cut doctor and hospital reimbursements, and cut senior citizen health care.

I have a letter I received today from a senior citizen in my district who may

very well decide to use managed health care right now, but that is her choice. Under the Republican budget, she will be forced to do it because she cannot afford the \$100 extra that it is going to cost her on her supplemental policy.

The other difference is the education cuts. The Republican budget over the 7 years will cut Federal funding for education just like the rescissions bill earlier this year cut schools in my district. It is wrong to cut Medicare and education to provide tax cuts.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton budget. Not only is it bloated and unbalanced but it contains a dog's breakfast of job-killing tax changes dreamed up by green eyeshade types apparently in the bowels of the Treasury.

For example, the Clinton budget would strike the so-called 2 percent de minimis rule which allows companies to invest up to 2 percent of their assets in tax-exempt bonds without any cumbersome recordkeeping. Eliminating this rule would severely impact the market for small issue industrial development bonds, a key local job creation instrument, and would raise interest costs for all State and local government borrowing. In short, eliminating this rule will eliminate jobs and raise local taxes.

In addition, the President's plan contains a proposal to deny deductions to companies on certain securities they issue, discriminating against long-term debt financing.

By limiting the financial options of American companies, the Clinton budget would limit their ability to invest in new equipment and technology. It would hurt the ability of American workers to compete in the world market. Vote against this budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on the trend of the gentlewoman from North Carolina talking about where we are today. As she pointed out, yesterday we voted roughly 390 to 41 to have a 7-year balanced budget. That is set up.

Where we are now at this very moment hopefully, our leaders and our President are meeting and going to get back on the track and especially back to the table so that we can begin talking about a budget that we can all agree on and that we can pass and get the Government working again.

There are differences and they are honest differences in this budget that we should be talking about at the negotiating table. One of these is the cuts in the earned income tax credit, because when we look at the amounts being suggested, this would roughly increase taxes by \$508 a year for roughly 3.3 million Americans, low-income-earning, working families. The coal-

ition budget, which we are not even talking about here today, takes the 7-year balanced budget CBO scoring and does not do this.

I am just saying, let us get back to the table, let us have a budget. That one is not even alive anymore.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the balanced budget is made up of many components, one of which is welfare reform, and I would like to talk about it very briefly. It is an issue that both sides have expressed their opinions about.

In looking at that component of the President's package, I think we find that it falls short of both of our expectations. All of us recognize that if we are going to reform welfare, first of all we have to emphasize work. The conference committee report puts more people to work every year than does the President's plan.

Second, we have to emphasize individual responsibility. Time limits. We are told in a recent survey that the average family now stays on welfare for 6½ years and that will rise to 13 years. The conference committee report puts a 2-year limit with an overall 5-year limit. The President's plan literally would allow people to remain in a subsidized program and never go into the private sector.

Third is State flexibility. States are our partners in welfare reform. Under the Clinton proposal, they still have to go through a bureaucratic maze and beg the HHS for waivers in order to put their plans into place. The conference committee report gives them flexibility.

Last of all, it should not serve as a magnet for those who are immigrants into our country. I would tell Members that the conference committee report is far superior in the area of welfare reform.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this proposal which does not balance the budget and with really great disappointment that we are not going to be allowed to consider the coalition plan today.

Nobody here is more serious about deficit reduction than the coalition, but make no mistake, there is a right way and a wrong way to balance the budget. The coalition, the blue dog Democrats, proves that in 7 years you can balance the budget without undermining the American family farmer, you can balance the budget without limiting opportunities for our children and our grandchildren to better themselves through education, and you can balance the budget without jeopardizing the health care that our seniors have relied on for over 30 years.

The coalition substitute balances the budget with fairness, common sense

and without gimmicks. Right from the start we have been motivated by a commitment to both fiscal responsibility and fairness. We are determined to meet our responsibility not to burden future generations with our debt but we are also determined to preserve what is working, the very best policies that enable our children to succeed, our farmers to compete and our seniors to feel secure that their health needs will be met.

The coalition is willing to work with anyone who wants to balance the budget. We know that our colleagues may not agree with everything we want to do, but we want to stop wasting the time of the American people and start working on a solution. This is a great opportunity that must not be wasted. We must do the right thing by our children and our grandchildren. We must start working together. I hope we do it now.

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

Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States came into this Chamber to make his first speech to a joint session of Congress, he observed that only by controlling the runaway growth of Medicare could we hope to ever balance the budget. We do that in our budget by transforming Medicare contrary to the misinformation and wrongful rhetoric for political purposes. We force no one off of the current program. They may elect to continue with the current program. But we offer them choices, choices that will give them more benefits at less cost and at the same time transform Medicare and save it, not just for the next election but for the next generation.

For 15 years, CBO scores our plan to save Medicare so that it will not go bankrupt. That is what this balanced budget is about. But it is also about saving Medicare.

Now the Democrats should not be able to have it both ways. They claim on the one hand that the President has submitted a balanced budget in 7 years. Yet if in fact it is not specific enough to be scored by CBO, which they have argued today in the way that we present it, how can it be concluded to be in balance? It is not specific. If it could be, it would then certainly undermine their argument that what we present is not scored by CBO. They cannot have it both ways.

Hopefully the President, who is meeting right now with our leadership, will finally come to the bargaining table and seriously present a CBO-scored 7-year balanced budget with real numbers. Let us find solutions for the next generation, not political fixes for the next election.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, and to my neighbor from Houston, that unfortunately what we are doing today is all

about rhetoric. This is not about the budget process. We do not have the coalition budget on the table that is a 7-year CBO budget. This is about how absurd things get in this House the closer we seem to get to Christmas.

Last week we passed a bill that was supposed to save Social Security from an impending default which would destroy our creditworthiness and in fact the bill would do the opposite. This week we are voting on a budget that is not even the real budget that the President submitted. This is just something to buy time so we can come down and talk on the floor. This is a Dale Carnegie course for the House of Representatives.

The fact of the matter is that we ought to be sitting down negotiating at the table. We have a coalition budget that we could talk about. Your budget is not the only way to do things. You all are not the smartest people in the world as much as you would like to think.

Let me say it is absurd. You all talk about interest rate cuts. You use your CBO and you say it is going to cut interest rates by 200 basis points, but when you look at what CBO says, it is going to cut them by 35 basis points. The fact of the matter is we are not doing our work. Let us do our work and let us go home.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Commerce Committee were proud and privileged, earlier this year, when we were called upon to play a central role in the development of the first balanced budget for this Republic in a generation.

We were called upon to make difficult choices, overdue choices, choices that are imperative if we and our children are to maintain this economy.

With respect to Medicaid, as in so many other areas, those choices involved political risk. But that is the essence of leadership. And as we all know, leadership has been in short supply in this Capitol for far too long.

We took the political risks. We made the difficult choices.

We transformed Medicaid, with more money for more doctors and more medicines—and fewer bureaucrats, fewer rules, less paperwork.

We brought Medicaid spending under control, and for the first time since the

Great Depression, we moved power away from the Washington bureaucrats.

We gave responsibility back to the people in their States and local communities, where Medicaid can be managed more fairly and with greater efficiency.

And Bill Clinton sat in the bleachers. For years, when he was Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton came to this Congress and asked us to give the States the power to manage their own Medicaid programs.

Today, he gives those States an unfunded mandate instead. A mandate from Washington to the States, without the money to pay for it—a mandate of the sort we outlawed, earlier this Congress, and which the President himself has signed into law.

This is not just another unfunded mandate.

This is the "Mother of All" unfunded mandates—one with a pricetag for State and local taxpayers of \$47 billion.

If President Clinton were to succeed in this stalemate, if he were to get his way with the so-called per-capita cap on Medicaid, it would force the States to come up with an additional \$47 billion.

That is because the States would still have to comply with all the rules, all the requirements of the existing Medicaid system, but with a cap on the amount of Federal money to help them do so.

Forty-seven billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, 47 billion hard-earned dollars. Money that could be used for schoolbooks, for teachers, for roads and bridges.

As Bill Clinton himself told us in 1989, in a Resolution he wrote which was signed by 49 of the 50 Governors, "the Medicaid mandates have put great stress on state budgets and undermined the states' ability to properly fund education and other important services."

As Governor after Governor has told us, the President's budget is a recipe for disaster—all the Washington rules, all the Washington mandates, just a cap on the amount of money that Washington is willing to contribute.

The members of my committee are here, Mr. Speaker, to make the case—loud and clear—that America can no longer afford the pricetag of Washington's bumbling good intentions, and that the States are ready, willing and able to deliver better health care for the poor and elderly, at lower cost, if only they are given the chance.

□ 1530

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I think this rhetoric today and all of the things that have been said point up the need for an American solution.

In the unlikely event there is anybody still watching these proceedings, I think they are tired of listening to blaming of the President, blaming of this, blaming of that. It is not getting us anywhere.

I asked Coach Adolph Rupp one time years ago if it was true that it was not whether or not you won or lost but how you played the game. He said, "Well, I guess that may have some truth to it. But if that is totally the truth, why do they have a scoreboard at either end?" I would suggest there is a scoreboard up at this end and a scoreboard here. If you want to balance the budget, bring any budget, the President's, Republican, coalition, bring it in here on an open rule. Let us sit in here, start the voting on amendments. If you get more than 50 percent, you win. It goes on. If you do not, it does not.

Let us sit down and work and balance the budget. That is what people want us to do in this country.

This business the President did or did not do this or did not do that, people are tired of that. They want us to go to work.

In a democracy, thank God in a democracy, when the other fellow is as intellectually honest and sincere in his beliefs as you or I may be, the way you do things is sit down and you try to reach a consensus and compromise. You do not have to do that if you live under a dictatorship or under communism. But in a free country, no one gets their way on everything.

Republicans run the House now. We understand that. But let us come in here with an open rule, sit down and go through item by item, as long as people can stand it, and sooner or later we will have a balanced budget for the American solution.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today's debate on the President's budget raises questions in the reminds of our people, and it is our responsibility to answer these questions truthfully.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment, I will focus on the Medicaid Program. Everyone agrees that Medicaid cannot continue in its present state. Between 1990 and 1994, it was the fastest growing part of the Government. The programs' average annual growth rate was more than 19 percent. Over the years, the Nation's Governors have complained bitterly to Congress about the unfunded mandates that have been placed upon States.

On August 1, 1989, the Nation's Governors' Association sent a letter to Congress urging us to "adopt a 2-year freeze on the enactment of further Medicaid mandates." The letter was signed by 49 Governors, including then Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton.

In this Congress, we are listening to these Governors. The Medigiant plan approved by Congress shifts responsibility for the Medicaid Program to the States, where it will be closer to the people it serves. Washington bureaucrats would no longer make the decisions. However, a handful of Governors and at least one former Governor are now criticizing this effort, wishing to retain control in Washington.

I might add that my home State of Florida received \$13 million in Federal dollars over the last 7 years. During the next 7 years, under our plan, Florida will receive better than \$33 billion. This is a cut?

Ironically, the President's budget advocates a principle that is completely contrary to that in the 1989 letter he signed. His budget continues the current flawed and failing program. This means Washington micromanagement continues, and State flexibility, a top priority of Governors, would not be permitted.

Plainly and simply, Mr. Speaker, the Medicaid program cannot survive unless the needed Medigiant reforms are made law, and this program must be saved. Accepting anything less would be breaking faith with those who depend upon it, and that would be the real injustice.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been through incredible political brinksmanship, NEWT GINGRICH has managed to shut down our Government, and by Christmas Day cost the American taxpayer a little over a billion dollars with these two shutdowns, paying Federal workers not to work. But now, with this resolution, in addition to brinksmanship, we have gamesmanship. It is as if we are going to consider a make-believe budget that they are presenting and planning to vote against instead of sitting down in good-faith negotiations to try to resolve this problem.

It is as if they have been watching too much daytime television. You know, it is like "Let's Make a Deal." "Mr. And Mrs. America, behind door No. 1, we have got misery. We have got misery for those families who will be called on to pay for a senior who gets left in a nursing home when you raid the family's income. Behind door No. 2, you can choose indifference. Yes, if you are a young person concerned about an education, if you are concerned about clean air or clean water, go with door No. 2. And behind door No. 3, why, we have got tax breaks, yes, tax breaks."

And so you choose door No. 3, and what do our Republican friends say? Are you a corporation that made a lot of money and did not want to pay any taxes? No? Well, then you are not entitled to go to door No. 3. Are you a family sitting up there at the top of the economic ladder feeling really good and being asked to sacrifice by taking

a little more income and a bigger tax break? Well, no. Well, then you are not entitled to go to door No. 3; you can only go to misery or to indifference, which is what this Republican budget is all about.

You see, they have failed yet to present a balanced budget, a balanced budget that provides balance to the American people and fairness to the American people.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is simple: Should seniors be given the same choices in their health care that Members of Congress enjoy?

Under the Republican plan to save Medicare, seniors get choices just like we do. They can choose from traditional Medicare, HMOs, PPOs, Provider Sponsored Organizations, Medical Savings Accounts, or other private insurance packages.

Under the Republican plan, seniors' first choice is traditional Medicare. Seniors are automatically enrolled in traditional Medicare if they don't choose a different option.

Under the President's plan, seniors do not get all of these choices. Isn't it time that we allow seniors to enroll in the same types of plans that Members of Congress can enroll in. Don't you think it's time we give seniors the same options that we give ourselves under our health plan.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal before us today includes the President's plan to get money from Medicare. His plan does not include giving seniors all the choices that the Republican plan would provide.

I urge my colleagues to reject the President's budget proposal. We have already proven that we can do better.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the freshman Republican class thinks they are the only ones sent here to work for change. But as a second-term Member, I was sent to bring about commonsense change.

But, instead, everyone is here today throwing stones, arguing political rhetoric. You know what that is, that is the status quo, exactly what I came here to change.

No Member, no Member in this body, I do not think, would be willing not to stay here Christmas Day if they thought there was a true national crisis. But it is not fair. It is not fair to the Federal employees, to our families, to the American people, most of all, to fabricate a crisis for the sake of a campaign slogan.

Because there is a commonsense budget out there that does balance the national budget by the year 2000, and it

does it with good, honest CBO numbers. That is the coalition budget. If we are serious about doing the American people's business, we would have that budget up and we would be negotiating it now because it is good policy. It does not devastate agriculture. It does not devastate rural health, seniors, or our young people and education.

So I encourage all Members to come to the table here to find a commonsense solution for the American people who sent us.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR].

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the Clinton budget plan, particularly with regard to health care rationing through micromanagement by HCFA.

The President's Medicaid plan is a per capita cap plan which maintains all of the mandates, regulations, and obstacles to flexibility just as they are, while limiting the amount of money the States will receive. In a nutshell, the President is placing dollar figures on the value of health care for poor Americans, and forcing the States to use the cookie cutter method once again to classify who is Medicaid eligible. Poor children get the least and poor elderly get the most, regardless of their individual circumstances. Not only does this open the door to fraud and abuse via misclassification, it hoggies the States and actually creates a much more difficult situation than the horrendous circumstances that States currently face.

Worst of all, the President's plan will enable HCFA to create a virtual health care police state in every State in the country to track down those who would misclassify beneficiaries. HCFA will dispatch dozens of bureaucrats to detect such practices.

This is the worst possible solution for a program which already faces way too many problems. The President's plan is unfair, unworkable, indefensible, and is doomed to failure. The Republican plan, on the other hand, frees States to enact innovative solutions to the difficult situations they face, utilizing the resources that are available. Mr. Speaker, we want to give States the ability to innovate with regard to providing health care for poor Americans, not place the States in a regulatory strait jacket with no room to move.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH was named Time Magazine's "Man of the Year". Today, the man of the year brings us the scam of the year. That's what this resolution is, a colossal scam.

Everybody knows that when you can't defend your position, you change

the subject. That's what this resolution is—a diversionary tactic. Republicans cannot defend cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment to finance a tax break for the wealthy.

The American people have rejected the GOP budget which will do harm to the people of this country. But, instead of working to come up with a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people, the Speaker shuts down the Government, throwing thousands of people out of work a week before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, stop playing games with people's lives. Stop playing games on the floor of the people's House. Give the American people an early Christmas present: a balanced budget that reflects America's priorities, not yours.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I rise in opposition to what we are calling the President's budget. It is, in the materials that I have, the Clinton administration December 7 budget option which we are referring to in some of our working papers as Clinton's budget option No. 4.

I want to speak specifically on two specific items in this budget: the President's proposal for Medicare, which covers health care needs for senior citizens; and Medicaid, which covers health care for low-income Americans.

In Medicare, the balanced budget bill that we passed and the President vetoed would have resulted, according to CBO, in savings in waste, fraud, and abuse of \$3.4 billion over 7 years. The President's option has Medicare savings in waste, fraud, and abuse of \$2.4 billion, which is \$1 billion less.

In relationship to Medicaid, which is health care for low-income Americans, the budget bill that the President vetoed, we would have block-granted Medicaid, given more money to the States, given the Governors and the State legislatures the opportunity to actually run the programs as they saw fit. In the case of Texas, the State that I represent in the Congress, Texas would have received \$55 billion over 7 years, including half a billion dollars for legal alien health care costs.

□ 1645

The President's budget is silent on that. It maintains Medicaid as an entitlement and does not give the States the right to do anything. I hope we would reject the President's budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we are engaged in a debate over a supposed presidential budget that does not actually represent the President's position. I think it is important for us

to recognize that the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, last week came out with projections that are new, and that the President today is completing work on a new budget proposal.

What is the point of having a debate and a vote on something that all of us know is already out of date? Instead, I suggest that we ought to be addressing the basic underlying conflict that plagues us here in the House of Representatives and in Congress in reaching an agreement with the President.

There are two basic issues: The first is tax cuts, and the second is block-granting Medicaid. I think almost everybody in this body agrees that we ought to cut taxes. We disagree on whether that ought to be the top priority or whether balancing the budget ought to be the top priority. And if it is not the top priority to cut taxes, can we actually wait and cut taxes after we have balanced the budget?

I submit that the top priority is balancing the budget, and we ought to wait with the tax cuts until we have accomplished that. I submit that if we made that fundamental decision, that we could reconcile with the President the issue of how we deal with block-granting Medicaid.

The coalition has presented a budget which does exactly this. It is a midground budget between the extremes that are represented in the debate today.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the budget plan offered by the President. There are many reasons to vote "no" today, particularly because the President's budget violates the pledge the Congress and the President made to enact 7-year balanced budgets using honest numbers.

But there is another reason to object to the President's budget. The President's plan guts health care improvements for seniors in rural America contained in the bill passed by Congress. Under current law, the formula used to pay private health plans participating in Medicare varies widely and unreasonably. While plans in some areas of the country receive over \$7,500 per year for each senior, an HMO or other plan in a Adair County, IA, would get less than \$3,000. The Clinton budget continues this unfair reimbursement. It protects the status quo. Iowans pay just as much into the Medicare system as everyone else in the country does.

The president of the Iowa health association has stated "Iowa Medicare beneficiaries deserve to have the same kind of choices which are available already in New York City, Miami, and southern California. The Republican budget bill is a good first step in addressing Medicare health plan payment equity."

The balanced budget plan passed by the House and Senate addresses this issue. The President's budget plan is a slap in the face to rural health care. We worked too hard and made too much progress to let this issue die. We owe it to seniors in rural areas to defeat the Clinton budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard my Republican colleagues get up time after time today and criticize their budget bill that is before us today. My answer is very simple: Why are they bringing the bill up? They are in the majority. If they think the bill is a bad bill, why are they debating it and why did they bring it to the floor?

I think the Republican majority has forgotten it is their responsibility to govern. They should be bringing up a continuing resolution so the Government is not shut down. Friday passed, Monday passed, and now it Tuesday. No CR was brought up. The Government is shut down. They should bring up an appropriations bill so the Government would not be shut down and we can get on with the business of governing. No appropriations bill comes up.

They made a commitment a few weeks ago with the CR they were going to protect Medicare, protect Medicaid, protect the environment. Once again we see no movement whatsoever on the budget to try to protect these important programs that the American people want protected and that have been a success.

I do not understand the whole philosophy of what they are doing today. They are simply wasting our time. They know that this is a bill that will not pass. They are not even going to give it a single vote, I do not think, and yet they continue to debate it. It is not fair.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from New Jersey, protests that the bill before us in fact does not fairly represent the President's positions and wonders why we bring this vehicle to the floor. The reason we do is because the President has never submitted a budget that actually reflects his positions. He has never done that.

The story really begins in 1992 when Bill Clinton ran for President. He made every promise anyone ever asked him to do in order for votes. He promised he could balance the budget in 5 years. He promised a middle-class tax cut. He promised to spend more money on virtually every program in the country.

The fact of the matter is, and the President knows it and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it, it is impossible to do that and balance

the budget in 7 years scored with honest numbers. It is impossible. That is why the President has to this date never walked into the room with a document that balances the budget in 7 years, scored by honest numbers. He has never done that to this date, and it is nearly Christmas.

So my colleagues and I, out of a sense of frustration, to show the country that the President of the United States has not even submitted a budget that his party will support, bring it to the floor today to show that the President of the United States remains, this late in the year, bereft of a plan that lives up to the conflicting promises that he has made through his campaign in 1992 and the conflicting statements that he has made throughout his tenure as President.

This is a bad bill. We are waiting for an honest bill from the President of the United States.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, this dreadful Christmas budget standoff will only end when Members of the majority work with Members of the minority to bridge the differences that divide us. The scriptures say blessed are the peacemakers, and I congratulate each and every one who is working today to try to find a way to resolve these differences.

Now, in contrast to that effort, the resolution before us is a shallow, obviously partisan effort, to preen and posture, rather than tend to substantive business. With portions of the Government shut down and with budget talks at impasse before they have even begun, the American people can expect much more of the House than this silly sideshow today.

For those of us looking for a bipartisan agreement, I commend your attention to the coalition budget plan. It reaches a balanced budget, it does so in 7 years, it uses CBO numbers. It protects vital programs. The coalition plan restores \$75 billion to the cuts the majority has proposed for Medicare. It adds back \$68 billion to Medicaid, reducing by more than 50 percent the devastating cuts the vetoed budget would have imposed.

When we finish wasting our time on this meaningless resolution, I look forward to working with one and all on arriving at a balanced budget plan. I suggest the coalition budget will be a very good way to get this difficult job done.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, for the 10th day this year, major sectors of the American Government are at a standstill, with the White House and Congress at an impasse.

We have heard from our friends on the other side that this debate is an attempt to embarrass the President.

No. With the Government in gridlock, this is an effort to give the President's plan its day in Court.

As this debate has progressed, it has become apparent that what is at stake for the President is not an effort to balance the budget. What is at stake for him is the status quo—uncontrolled spending, bigger bureaucracies, higher taxes on the American people.

It is hard to imagine a deficit more in need of fixing. It is hard to imagine a program in greater risk than Medicare.

And it is hard to imagine a worse situation than the current Medicaid setup—Federal micromanagement, thousands of bureaucrats, volumes of rules.

And yet nowhere in these rules do we see the word "patient."

Nowhere do we see the words "quality of care."

It is hard to imagine a structure more complex, more inefficient than Medicaid is today.

But as the last 15 minutes of debate has shown, the President's proposal on Medicaid does just that—all the rules, all the mandates, all the bureaucrats, but a cap on the money available to the States to comply.

It is the biggest unfunded mandate in history, with a pricetag to the States of \$47 billion.

Mr. President, I hope you are watching me now. I beg you, sir. Listen to this debate, watch the vote today, and realize that your plan fails on its own weight.

Then come to the table, Mr. President, and work with us in good faith. Let us do what you asked as Governor—give the States the responsibility for better Medicaid, with better health care, at lower costs, for more elderly and poor Americans.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], my good friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of all the rhetoric that I am hearing on the floor of this House. Everyone in America knows now that this shameful Government shutdown has nothing to do with reaching a balanced budget. It has to do with not passing the appropriations bill. Federal workers are sitting at home and our constituents are disgusted because this Congress has not completed its work. Unable to agree among themselves, the majority party is threatening the President to accept radical changes in policy or shut down the Government.

Well, I've got news for you. People's problems do not recognize a shut down. For example, the Annie Johnson Senior Center in Dunellon, FL, can no longer accept senior citizens to its congregating dining table because the Labor-HHS bill has not been passed. For the past 15 years, this center has been funded by the Older Americans Act. It provides home delivered meals, transportation, and homemaking help for senior citizens in Dunnellon. However, because this Republican Congress has not done its job, the center could close down.

It is time to get beyond this tiresome bickering and pass a continuing resolution that gets Americans back to work. Balancing the Federal Budget is everyone's objective but we do not need to ruin Christmas for Federal workers to achieve that goal. How we get to a balanced Federal budget can be debated after we put Americans back to work.

Stop the games and open up the Government. Peoples problems do not recognize a shutdown. Seniors need their food. Veterans need their benefits. College students need their loans. This is Christmas. The majority should quit playing scrooge and approve a CR. That is the best present we could give the American people.

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

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentlewoman that the reason that bill has not passed is because it is filibustered by the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate.

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

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman, was the center open when the House passed the continuing resolution?

Mrs. THURMAN. Yes, it was.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, while the President's overall approach to the budget is deplorable, he actually occupies the conservative high ground on the issue of student loans. Both guaranteed and direct student lending are Government programs, and both are run primarily by the private sector. The key difference is in the pricing of those private sector services.

Under guaranteed lending, all the payments to the private sector are determined politically—by Congress in the Higher Education Act. Under direct lending, all private sector services are procured through competitively bid contracts. [Let me repeat: under guaranteed lending, every payment made to private parties is determined politically. Under direct lending, every payment to private parties is determined in a market process.] Conservatives should prefer a market process over a political process every time.

It should come as no surprise that direct lending, as a market-oriented program, also costs less. The CBO does not score the savings primarily because it scores direct loans as if they were fixed

rate loans carrying interest rate risk for the Government, when in fact they are variable rate loans with no such risk. Conservatives should care more about the real cost than the CBO cost.

Mr. Speaker, politically set payments for private services are a classic recipe for corporate welfare, and guaranteed student loans demonstrate it. I deeply regret that many Members of my party have been led to support home State special interests rather than true conservative principles on this issue. I believe it undermines all our other efforts at Government reform, and therefore I urge all my colleagues to examine this issue much more closely.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, in 1776, our Founding Fathers fought it out at the Continental Congress trying to work out their differences, and they were able to work it out and form what we know of as the United States of America. I do not know why we cannot work out our differences now.

Harry Truman once said if you want a friend in Washington, DC, buy yourself a dog. Maybe that is what is wrong with us. Maybe we need to buy a dog, because it is obvious a lot of us do not know how to talk to one another. It is obvious we do not know how to work with one another, and it is surely obvious that we do not know how to solve any problems.

The American people are sick and tired of this gridlock that we have now. I blame some of it on the freshman Republicans, because some of them believe if you compromise, that you lose your principles.

□ 1600

Well, I do not think that is true at all. I think and believe very strongly that we can have a difference of opinion without having a difference of principle. That is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the question I have is why are we voting on this budget today. This gets us no closer to breaking the impasse which currently exists today and, in fact, acts as a wedge between the President and the Republican Congress preventing a budget agreement from ever being reached.

It has been said that a House divided against itself will not stand. It could also be said that a Government divided against itself will not stand. Before our foundation begins to crumble even more, it is time for the President and the Republican leaders in Congress to agree to compromise to end the current Federal Government shutdown.

Compromise is a word that has been thrown around in Washington quite a bit lately, but the time has come to stop talking the talk and start walking the walk: Congress needs to pass a temporary—very temporary—spending bill without any superfluous additions; we need to pass the six remaining appropriations bills; and, most importantly, we need to sit at the table together and agree to a 7-year balanced budget. But everyone needs to give a little. We all need to compromise.

The current budget impasse has been without a doubt the most frustrating situation I have endured as a Member of Congress. I am a strong proponent of balancing our budget, just as I am strongly committed to protecting our environment; enhancing education for our young people; and guaranteeing necessary health care for our seniors. There is a way to protect these vital interests and still crack the current budget gridlock, and that is through honest compromise and negotiation.

I have been meeting regularly with a bipartisan group of Members of Congress who are committed to solving this crisis, and who are willing to give a little to get a little. We support a balanced budget using numbers from the Congressional Budget Office that minimize the tax cuts proposed by the GOP while increasing funding for Medicare and Medicaid. The time has come for this spirit of optimism and compromise to find its way to the upper echelon of Government so that we can all move toward the middle and find an acceptable resolution to this budget fiasco.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

There has been a lot of talk about the Republicans killing student loans in the last few months, and today, I want to set the record straight. The Balanced Budget Act that the President vetoed actually enhanced the postsecondary student's ability to get a loan. Under our plan, every student will be able to receive a student loan. The student loan provisions in the Balanced Budget Act achieve our goal of protecting student loans for every student and saving taxpayer dollars.

Student loan dollars increase by 50 percent over the next 7 years. Every student who applies will be able to receive a student loan. No parent or student pays more for a loan under our budget than they do under the current law or under the President's budget, for that matter. More importantly, our budget spends money to give students more flexible repayment terms.

The President's budget fails to include such a provisions, making one wonder why the President does not feel that all students should have the same opportunity to select from various repayment terms.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], my good friend.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend for yielding me this time.

People listening to this debate have to be wondering what we are debating about and why we are debating this. It is certainly not advancing a bipartisan solution of our budget crisis in this country, and it is certainly not about deficit reduction, because the budget resolution before us is not being seriously considered. Those who brought it forward indicate they will vote against it.

Democrats would welcome a new budget resolution. We know that the Republican budget resolution is not

going to become law. We welcome bringing a new budget resolution to the floor. Many of us have suggested the coalition budget, a budget that has much more deficit reduction, realistic spending targets, and protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. It does that by putting tax breaks after we balance the budget.

If we want to reduce the deficit, we can do that today. Let us pass a clean CR and stop wasting \$40 million a day of the taxpayers' money by closing Government when it should be open and we should be negotiating a new budget.

These are childish games to be debating this type of an issue while Government is closed. We need serious negotiations without preconditions. That is what the Democrats are asking for.

Yes, the Majority asked about a 7-year balanced budget and CBO numbers. We are prepared for that. But what my constituents are saying is, where is the change in the budget that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment?

The continuing resolution that we passed last month contained those promises as well, but the Republicans have not, in good faith, brought forth changes in their budget in order to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop these games, let us sit down and negotiate a budget that we can all agree with so that we can pass a new budget resolution on the floor of this House that, yes, brings us to a balanced budget but also protects the priorities that are important to the American people. That is what we should be doing here today and not playing the games on this resolution.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter I recently received from a young man named Aaron from my district.

He writes, "When I turned 16 I did two things right away. I went out and obtained my driver's license, and I got a job. I am now almost 17 and have been working at various jobs for the past year. I have learned a lot from working, such as the value of money, the responsibility of having a job and how important it is to get a good education. One big thing I learned is that taxes will affect me for the rest of my life."

"Before I started working I had no idea how much the government really took out of your paycheck for taxes. I have discovered that it is a lot of money. Actually, I don't really mind paying the money, as long as it is not too outrageous, and if I know for sure that one day I will benefit. For example, I want to be sure that when I am old enough to receive Social Security and Medicare, it will still be around."

"I want to thank you for all your efforts toward decreasing taxes, and in

making sure that the things my taxes pay for, such as Medicare and Social Security, will still be around in the future."

Mr. President, when you promised to present a balanced budget, you promised it to young men and women like this. Keep your promise, help us pass a balanced budget and keep faith with America.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I expect that there will be some embarrassment today among some of my Democratic colleagues who will find themselves voting against President Clinton's budget. I remember in the 1980's the humiliation that Republicans experienced when they voted against several budgets of our beloved former President, Ronald Reagan.

There have been votes against the Bush budget, votes against the Carter budget. In fact, I have been here 17 years, and I remember only 2 budgets that truly were the budgets of the President that passed this Congress in those 17 years. Three years ago, by one vote. In fact, I tied the vote and Congresswoman Margolies-Mezvinsky cast the deciding vote, and President Clinton got the budget he wanted.

Early in President Reagan's term, in his first year, he got the budget he wanted. All other Presidents, all other budgets since I have been here, have been turned down by this House, regardless of who was President.

This House has passed only budgets when the President would compromise with us. So today's vote, which I expect will come down against President Clinton, will be nothing new.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I realize and I empathize with those on the other side of the aisle who do not want to vote on the President's budget. My colleague put me through that exercise many, many times during the last, I do not know how many years. It is painful for a little while, but it goes away very quickly. So have no fear.

I want to thank the minority leader for indicating that he has a concern about school lunch. I hope he will join with me. I have a tremendous concern about school lunch. Fifty percent of all of the children who are eligible for free and reduced-priced meals do not participate. Do not participate. That means they are in school all day long, I suppose, without any food. I suppose they have no breakfast when they come to school.

So we should not do the status quo that the gentlewoman from Arkansas talked about. We should make changes. So I am happy that the gentleman is ready to deal with that.

Another person from the other side talked about decimating education.

Well, education is 6 percent of the budget from the national level. That is all we spend, 6 percent. But let me tell my colleagues, in the 7 years that we are talking about, we are willing to spend \$340 billion. The minority, in the last 7 years, spent \$315 billion. We are ready to spend \$25 billion more than they spent in the last 7 years.

Over the next school year, national spending on elementary and secondary education under our budget will increase by 4.1 percent. Again, let us talk about access to excellence and not mediocrity. Going back to the gentlewoman from Arkansas again, let us talk about something other than the status quo.

The gentleman from Maryland, who is going to speak later, has joined with me the last couple of years, but prior to that, I was the only one who kept talking about what we are getting in terms of quality from chapter 1. What we are getting as far as quality is concerned in Head Start.

Well, chapter 1, title I, we have spent \$90 billion since 1967, and this is the report we get from the Department of Education. Comparison of similar cohorts by grade and poverty show that program participation does not reduce, not reduce, the test score gap for disadvantaged students. Indeed, chapter 1 students scored in all poverty cohorts declined between the third and fourth grade.

Going to Head Start, we have spent \$31.2 billion on the Head Start program, and this is, again, what they say. Unchecked growth over the last 5 years has brought about sloppy program management. Of course, every President and every Congress has said we will put more into the program. And so the program has increased in 5 years' time 186 percent. Do my colleagues know what it increased as far as participation is concerned? It increased participation 39 percent.

The expenditure increases 186 percent, the participation 39 percent. And as the Secretary of HHS said, we do not say that improving quality will cost more money. So, again, let us not have the status quo. Let us insist on excellence in education, not just access.

Mr. Speaker, one other area, let me talk about very quickly, and that is the whole area of higher education. The President says that in his proposal he saves \$3 billion in higher education by slashing the income earned by the banks and the State guarantee agencies. Folks, that cannot be. How can that happen? Because he is going to direct lending 100 percent in 2 years' time, so he cannot get \$3 billion from the rest of the lending programs. He has eliminated them all in a 2-year budget. So he cannot say he will get \$3 billion there.

Mr. Speaker, we got \$5 billion from those same agencies, but we also allow the competition, and that is what we are talking about when we set up the program. We want to see in a 7-year period what is better. We cannot, if he

goes directly, and he cannot save that kind of money.

So, again, look carefully at these budgets and let us talk about excellence rather than just access to mediocrity.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, let us be honest with the public about what is going on and what is not going on. What is supposed to be going on right now is a negotiation between the President and the leadership of the House and Senate. In that negotiation each comes to the table with a position. During the negotiation each makes different offers about where they could move and where they could change.

The President made such an offer of movement during a previous negotiation last week. That was not the President's budget. It was an offer of movement in a negotiation. What this resolution we are debating today represents is the chairman of the Committee on the Budget attempting to identify, with a large variety of assumptions, what that would look like in the form of a budget, and then bring it here and say we are voting on the President's budget.

That is not the truth. What we are doing is putting up a straw man to then take shots at so that we can attack the President as part of this negotiating posture. I would suggest it would be far more beneficial if rather than standing outside the room lobbing grenades into the negotiation room, that we actually find ways to find agreement between the two of us.

Now, if we want to negotiate with the President and the leadership, let them go into the room and we ought to stop throwing grenades in the room. If we want to do it here, if we do not want the President and the leadership to negotiate it, if we want to negotiate it here on the floor of the House, there is a way to do that.

We have suggested bring the majority resolution, the minority resolution, the President's, bring any resolution anyone wants to this floor under an open rule, without time limitations; put all of the Members in here, lock the doors, and do not even give any bathroom breaks, if the majority does not want to, but keep us here debating and using our voting card and doing what this Congress is supposed to do, what the people of the United States expect us to do, and let us vote and the winning vote passes. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my leader.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the President really has not come to the table, and that is what brings us here today. He promised in his campaign to balance the budget in 5 years, and then the next year he raised taxes on the American people by a greater amount than ever before.

□ 1615

And then February, February 1995, he says, "Well, I do not want to balance the budget. I just want to give the American people a deficit of about \$200 billion a year, sometimes \$300 billion a year, as far as the eye can see."

Then he came up with a second budget, a 10-year balanced budget, because he got a lot of criticism for the first one. Still, when the Congressional Budget Office scored that budget, it was \$200 billion in imbalance by the year 2005. Then he came up with a 7-year balanced budget, his third budget, and it was \$115 billion in imbalance. Now, we have the fourth budget, given to us only a few weeks ago; \$87 billion imbalance by the year 2002.

The President has said he is committed to a balanced budget within 7 years, but not now.

He says he is for tax cuts, or at least he has from time to time, but not now.

He says he is for Medicare reform and Medicaid reform, but not now.

He says he is for welfare reform, but not now.

He says he is even for discretionary cuts, but he criticizes the Congress for making those cuts in the appropriations process now.

Mr. Speaker, oh, he did say that he wanted to cut defense by \$7 billion, but he sent the troops off to Bosnia, so he said not now.

Otherwise, the President is in an awkward position. He really does want to protect the bureaucracy now; duplication of programs, waste, inefficiency of government, high regulation, yes, high taxes, centralized government. He is the champion of those issues now.

My colleagues might call him the stalwart of the status quo. But he says he wants a balanced budget within 7 years. Now, these conflict. How does he do it? Well, we ask him to present his budget, but he still has not gotten there.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest if the President wanted to balance the budget and save our economy and bring down interest rates and preserve the American dream for our children and our grandchildren, then he would come forward and put his package on the table, as we have done. But, unfortunately, there is no "there" there in the President's package. Ours is on the table. Where is his?

Our reforms in welfare, Medicare, and Medicaid, our cuts in taxes are all in the package that he has vetoed. Our attempts in the appropriations process to cut \$22 billion in this year's discretionary spending for fiscal year 1996 have, in part, been adopted and signed into law or accepted into law by the President. Seven bills have passed, and

I will offer for the RECORD the status of those. But three bills have been vetoed in the last 2 days. That is despite the fact that overall, our appropriations process has eliminated 260-plus programs and substantially cut hundreds of others. But the President says, "Not now."

He says, "No, we will veto those bills, and we will take up those bills later."

Mr. Speaker, Christmas is coming and we have not taken them up. We have got an impasse, a constitutional impasse. It is our prerogative under the Constitution to pass the laws and send them to him. It is his prerogative to veto them.

Where do we end up? I am not sure anybody knows, unless the President comes to the table now. His budget is a fig leaf. If he really wants to put America back on the right track, he should accept our budget and our appropriation bills. But maybe that is just not good politics. Mr. Speaker, I hope he comes to the table.

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

STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FISCAL
YEAR 1996

[As of December 19—3 p.m.]

7-Enacted into law.—Military Construction (P.L. 104-32); Agriculture (P.L. 104-37); Energy & Water (P.L. 104-46); Transportation (P.L. 104-50); Treasury-Postal Service (P.L. 104-52); Legislative Branch (P.L. 104-53); and National Security (P.L. 104-61).

3-Vetoed by the President.—Commerce-Justice-State; Interior; and VA-HUD.

1-Conference reports pending in Senate.—Foreign Operations (Amendment No. 115—Abortion).

1-Bill in conference.—District of Columbia.

1-Passed the House and pending Senate floor action.—Labor-HHS.

PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS

Transportation.—Highway demonstration projects (\$352 million); Local rail freight assistance (\$17 million); Penn Station Redevelopment (\$40 million); Interstate Commerce Commission (after Jan. 1) (\$15.4 million); Coast Guard buoy replacement project (\$8.5 million); Coast Guard 82-foot WPB capability replacement (\$4 million); Coast Guard HH-65 helicopter gearbox upgrade (\$2.5 million); Coast Guard GPS 2nd District (\$2.4 million); FAA "Quality through partnership" program (\$1.79 million); and FAA NAS management automation program (\$2 million).

FAA traffic management system (\$10.8 million); FAA Digital BRITE display (\$5.5 million); FAA remote maintenance monitoring system upgrade (\$3 million); FAA Integrated network management system (\$300,000); FAA precision runway monitors (\$1.2 million); FAA future airway facilities technologies (R&D) (\$3.4 million); FAA general aviation renaissance (\$1 million); Federal Hwy. Admin. OJT/supportive svcs. (\$5 million); FHWA ITS advanced technology applications (\$10 million); and FHWA ITS priority corridors (\$10 million).

Agriculture.—Cattle Tick Eradication Program, Food Stamp Program (\$12.5 million); Closed 3 Agriculture Research Svc. laboratories (\$1 million); Eliminated 26 research grants (\$4.7 million); and Nutrition Education Initiative, Extension activities (\$4.3 million).

Treasury-Postal Service.—Advisory Commission on Intergovt. Relations (\$216,000); Administrative Conference of the U.S. (\$1.2 million); Treasury Special Forfeiture Fund

(\$45 million); IRS Tax Compliance (\$405 million); OPM Federal Quality Institute (\$800,000); OPM International Affairs Office (\$140,000); OPM Research Office (\$2.2 million); OPM Job Information (\$2.5 million); and OPM Occupational Testing (\$14.4 million).

Legislative Branch.—Office of Technology Assessment (\$18.4 million); U.S. Code subscriptions for Members (\$420,000); House Parking Lot 6 (\$238,000); Warehouse at 120 Canal St., SE (\$181,000); Historical Society calendars for Members (\$850,000); Folding Room (privatized) (\$6.1 million); Barber Shop (privatized) (\$148,000); and Ended taxpayer-subsidized flag office (\$324,000).

Energy and Water.—Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor (\$20.7 million); Russian replacement program (\$5 million); Technology Partnership program (\$3 million); In House Energy Mgmt. (\$31.3 million); Water Conservation Challenge Partnerships (\$9 million); Energy/Water Product Efficiency Standards (\$450,000); Construction Prod. Advancement Research Program (\$6 million); and Nat'l Assessment of Water Supply Demand & Avail. (\$3 million).

Nat'l Spacial Data Infrastructure (\$2 million); Dredging Oper. and Environmental Research (\$3 million); Water Operations Tech. Support Program (\$1.5 million); River Confluence Ice Research (\$1 million); Natural Resources Technical Support (\$1.6 million); Environmental Review Guide for Operations (\$1.5 million); Reinvested User Fees for Recreation Improvements (\$5 million); and Real Time Water Control Research Program (\$850,000).

Interior.—Bureau of Mines (\$30 million); Emergency Preparedness (DOE) (\$8 million); Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp. (\$7 million); Urban park and recreation fund (\$6 million); State grants/land and water conservation fund (\$25 million); Business enterprise development grants (\$2 million); Indian direct loan program (\$1 million); Navajo rehabilitation trust fund (\$2 million); Rural abandoned mine program (RAMP) (\$8 million); Advanced computational technology initiative (\$10 million); and Coalbed methane program (\$2 million).

Planar solid oxide fuel cells program (\$3 million); Mild gasification process development unit (\$4 million); Gasifier improvement facility (\$4 million); Advanced absorption fluids (\$1 million); Microcogeneration (\$2 million); Lighting collaboratives (\$1 million); Federal energy efficiency fund (\$7 million); Cool communities (\$2 million); Training for commercial building operators (\$2 million); Pressure calciner project (\$2 million); and Aluminum spray forming (\$3 million).

Advanced fluid catalytic cracker (\$2 million); Food, textiles and agriculture program (\$1 million); Grants to industrial associations (\$1 million); Industrial assessments (\$1 million); CNG absorbent systems and tank design (\$1 million); Federal fleet vehicle acquisition (elim. central DOE fund) (\$20 million); Collaborative effort with DOT on crash behavior (\$1 million); Automotive piston technologies (\$5 million); Locomotive fuel cell program (\$1 million); Fuel cells for buses (\$3 million); and Integrated resource planning (utility sector programs) (\$9 million).

VA-HUD, Indep. Agencies.—National Community Service/Americorps (\$577 million); Community Development Financial Institutions (\$125 million); Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board (\$500,000); Office of Consumer Affairs (\$2.2 million); Public Housing Development (\$598 million); Enterprise Zone Homes (\$50 million); Pension Fund Partnerships (\$350 million); Flexible Subsidy Fund (\$50 million); Neighborhood Development (\$5 million); and Community Adjustment Planning (\$2 million).

National Homeownership Trust Demonstration (\$50 million); Congregate Housing

(\$25 million); Project Based Service Coordinators (\$22 million); Economic Development Initiative (\$350 million); Joint Community Development (\$6 million); Lease Adjustments (\$22 million); Loan Management (\$150 million); Public Housing Coordinators (\$30 million); and Service Coordinators (\$30 million).

Commerce, Justice, State.—Advanced Technology Program (\$340 million); U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration (\$14 million); \$2 million left for closeout costs); Non-point Pollution Source Control grants (\$5 million); Endowment for Children's Educational Television (\$2.5 million); Contributions to U.N. Industrial Dev. Organization (\$28 million); Competitive Policy Council (\$1 million); and Ounce of Prevention Council (\$1.5 million).

Labor, HHS (House eliminations).—Summer Youth (\$871 million); Low Income Home Energy Assistance (\$1 billion); Goals 2000 (\$372 million); Library Constitution & Categoricals (\$37 million); Corporation for National and Community Service/Americorps (\$577 million); Community Development Financial Institutions (\$125 million); Council on Environmental Quality (\$1.19 million); Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board (\$500,000); Severely Distressed Public Housing (\$500 million); Flexible Subsidy Fund—HUD (\$50 million); Congregate Services—HUD (\$25 million); HOPE grants (\$50 million); Youthbuild Program—HUD (\$50 million); and National Homeownership Trust Demonstration Program (\$50 million).

Department of Labor

Employment and Training Administration.—Youth Fair Chance (\$24 million); Rural Concentrated Employment (\$3.8 million); JTPA Concentrated Employment (\$6 million); National Commission for Employment Policy (\$2.2 million); American Samoans (Training & Employment Services) (\$5 million); Microenterprise Grants (\$2.25 million); National Occupational Information Committee (\$6 million); National Center for the Workplace (\$1.1 million); Office of the American Workplace Departmental Management (\$7.4 million); National Veteran's Training Institute (\$2.9 million).

Department of Health and Human Services

Public Health Services.—Trauma Care—Public Health Service (\$4.7 million); Black Lung Clinics (\$4.1 million); Payments to Hawaii-Hansen's Disease (\$2.9 million); Pacific Basin Initiative—Public Health Service (\$2.8 million); Native Hawaiian Health Care (\$4.5 million); and National Institute Occupational Safety & Health Training (\$12.8 million).

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.—Community Support Demonstrations—Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Admin. (\$24 million); Treatment Grants to Crisis Areas—Substance Abuse Services (\$35 million); Comprehensive Comm. Treatment Program—Substance Abuse Services (\$27 million); Training—Training Improvement Demos. (\$5.5 million); High Risk Youth—Prevention Demonstrations (\$65 million); Other Programs—Prevention Demonstration (\$6.6 million); Community Partnerships (\$114 million); and Prevention Education/Dissemination (\$13.4 million).

Assistant Secretary for Health.—Office of Disease Prevention & Health Promotion (\$4.6 million); Emergency Preparedness (\$2.1 million); and Health Care Reform Data Analysis (\$2.7 million).

Health Care Financing Administration.—Counseling Program (\$4.5 million); and New Rural Health Grants (\$1.7 million).

Administration for Children and Families.—Civics & English Education Grants (\$6 million); Child Development Associate Scholarships (\$1.3 million); ABCAN (\$288,000); Child

Welfare Research (\$6.3 million); Social Services Research (\$14.9 million); Family Support Centers (\$7 million); Community Based Resource Centers (\$31.3 million); Rural Housing (\$2.9 million); Farmworker Assistance (\$3 million); and Demonstration Partnerships (\$7.9 million).

Administration on Aging.—Ombudsman Services (\$4.4 million); Pension Counseling (\$1.9 million); Preventive Health (\$16.9 million); Aging Research & Special Project (\$26.5 million); Federal Council on Aging (\$176,000); and White House Conference on Aging (\$3 million).

Department of Education

State School Improvement (\$27 million); and Impact Aid—Payments for Federal Property (\$16 million).

School Improvement Programs.—Safe & Drug Free Schools—National Programs (\$25 million); Education Infrastructure (\$35 million); Law Related Education (\$5.8 million); Christa McAuliffe Scholarship (\$1.9 million); Women's Educational Equity (\$3.9 million); Training and Advisory Services (\$21.4 million); Dropout Prevention Demonstrations (\$28 million); and Ellender Fellowships (Close-Up).

Education for Native Hawaiians (\$12 million); Foreign Language Assistance (\$10 million); Training in Early Childhood (\$13 million); Comp. Regional Assistance Centers (\$44 million); and Family and Community Endeavor Schools (\$11 million).

Bilingual and Immigrant Education.—Support Services (\$14 million); and Professional Development (\$25 million).

Special Education.—Innovation and Development (\$20 million); Technology Applications (\$10 million); Special Studies (\$4 million); Personnel Development (\$91 million); Parent Training (\$13 million); Clearinghouses (\$2 million); Regional Resources Centers (\$7 million); Endowment Grants—National Tech. Institute for the Deaf (\$336,000); Construction—National Tech. Institute for the Deaf (\$150,000); and Endowment Grants—Gallaudet University (\$1 million).

Vocational and Adult Education.—Community Based Organizations (\$9 million); Consumer and Homemaker Education (\$34 million); State Councils (\$8.8 million); Demonstrations—National Program (\$20 million); National Occupational Info. Coord. Committee (\$6 million); Evaluation & Technical Assistance—Adult Education (\$3.9 million); National Institute for Literacy (\$4.8 million); and Workplace Literacy Partnerships (\$18 million).

Student Financial Assistance.—Federal Perkins Loans—Capital Contributions (\$158 million); State Student Incentive Grants (\$63 million); and State Post-Secondary Review Program (\$20 million).

Higher Education.—Endowment Grants (\$6 million); HBCU Set-aside (\$2 million); Evaluation (\$1 million); Native Hawaiian & Alaska Native Cultural Arts (\$1 million); Eisenhower Leadership Program (\$4 million); Innovation Projects in Community Service (\$1.4 million); Institute for International Public Policy (\$1 million); Cooperative Education (\$6.9 million); Law School Clinical Experience (\$14.9 million); Urban Community Service (\$13 million); Student Financial Aid Database (\$496,000); and Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center (\$4 million).

National Early Intervention Scholarship & Partnerships (\$3.1 million); Byrd Scholarships (\$29 million); National Science Scholarships (\$4.4 million); National Academy of Science, Space & Technology (\$2 million); Douglas Teacher Scholarships (\$14.5 million); Olympic Scholarships (\$1 million); Teacher Corps (\$1.8 million); Harris Scholarships (\$20 million); Javits Fellowships (\$7 million);

Faculty Development Fellowships (\$3.7 million); School, College and University Partnerships (\$3.8 million); and Legal Training for the Disadvantaged (\$2.9 million).

Howard University.—Regular Program—Endowment Program (\$3.5 million); Clinical Law Center—Endowment Program (\$5.5 million); Research (\$4.6 million); Construction (\$5 million); and College housing & Acad. Facilities Loans (\$1 million).

Education Research, Statistics & Improvements.—21st Century Learning (\$750,000); Eisenhower Prof. Development—Nat. Programs (\$21 million); Eisenhower Math/Science Education Consortia (\$15 million); National Writing Project (\$3.2 million); National Diffusion Network (\$14 million); Star Schools (\$30 million); Ready to Learn TV (\$7 million); and Telecommunications Demo for Math (\$2 million).

Libraries.—Construction (\$17 million); Library Literacy Programs (\$8 million); Library Education and Training (\$4.9 million) and Research and Demonstrations (\$6.5 million).

Department Management.—National Board of the Fund for the Improv. of Post Secondary Ed. (\$128,000); President's Ad. Comm. on Ed. Excellence for Hispanic Am. (\$286,000); and President's Bd. of Advisors on Hist. Black Colleges & Univ. (\$128,000).

Related Agencies.—Vista Literacy Corps—Domestic (\$5 million); Senior Demonstration Program (\$1 million); National Education Goals Panel (\$3 million); and National Ed. Standards & Improvement Council (\$2 million).

MAJOR CUTS IN PROGRAMS

Agriculture.—Congressional Affairs activities (\$1.1 million or 25%); USDA advisory committees (\$278,000 or 30%); Rural Housing Preservation Grants (\$11 million or 50%); Sect. 515 rental housing program (\$40 million or 21%); and Title III—commodity grants and P.L. 480 (\$67 million or 57%).

Transportation.—Essential Air Service (\$10.8 million); Transit formula grants (\$457 million); Transit operating assistance (\$310 million); Northeast corridor improvement program (\$85 million); and Amtrak operating subsidies (\$198 million).

Legislative Branch.—One-third Committee reduction (\$45 million); Eliminated 6,000 daily copies of The Congressional Record (\$1.5 million); Recording studio and photographers (\$1.2 million); Closed captioning (\$800,000); Joint committees (\$2.6 million or 22.8%); Architect of the Capitol (\$16.7 million); Govt. Accounting Office (\$75 million or 15%); Congressional Printing and Binding (\$6 million); and GPO Superintendent of Documents (\$1.9 million).

Energy and Water.—Army Corps of Engineers (\$138 million); Bureau of Reclamation (\$31 million); Dept. of Energy (\$173 million); Appalachian Regional Commission (\$102 million); Tennessee Valley Authority (\$29 million); and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (\$52 million).

Interior.—Territories (\$31 million); Bureau of Indian Affairs (\$160 million); Department of Energy (\$87 million); National Endowment on the Arts (\$52 million); National Endowment on Humanities (\$51.5 million); Institute of Museum Services (\$8.8 million); Natural Resources Research (\$25 million); Office of Surface Mining (\$24 million); and Natural Resource Agencies (\$200 million) (non-essential construction, land acquisition and grants).

VA-HUD, Indep. Agencies.—NASA (\$556 million); HUD (\$6.1 billion); Superfund (\$267 million); Environmental Protection Agency (\$1.5 billion); Academic Research Infrastructure (\$150 million); and Property Disposition (\$289 million).

National Security.—Technology Reinvestment Program (\$305 million); Consultants/research centers (\$90 million); Environmental

restoration (\$200 million); Cooperative Threat Reduction (\$71 million); Energy management programs (\$199 million); Defense acquisition/management (\$164 million); UN peacekeeping assessment (\$65 million); and Travel/support aircraft operations (\$129 million).

Commerce, Justice, State.—Department of Commerce (\$578 million); Asia Foundation (\$10 million); Contributions to Inter'l Organizations (\$172 million); Contributions to Inter'l Peacekeeping (\$293 million); Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (\$14.7 million); U.S. Information Agency (\$310 million); East-West Center (\$13 million); Federal Communications Commission (\$9.5 million); Legal Services Corporation (\$122 million); and State Justice Institute (\$8.3 million).

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 2½ minutes is insufficient time to correct all the misstatements, I am sure, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] made just now, so I will not endeavor to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we need to understand what we are doing. We are continuing to play games. The Committee on Rules has reported out this resolution, which they purport to be the President's provision in response to their reconciliation. Everybody honestly knows that is not the case.

This is the Republican reconciliation bill. Does anybody in this House believe this is an analogous document? Does anybody believe this is an analogous, fair, alternative proposal that the Republicans are putting on the floor? Does anybody? I do not believe it.

Mr. Speaker, these are six bills, smaller than the bill that I just raised. They are the appropriation bills that would run Government if we could pass them. The gentleman from Louisiana just got on the floor recently and said, "Where is the Labor-Health bill? It is being filibustered in the Senate." Why? Not on the money issue, but because they put an extraneous provision on that bill called strikebreaker so that people can be fired without notice.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that is their position. We do not agree with it. But it should not be on that bill and it should not be on any one of these six. We ought to make them law.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution. It is simple and it says we will continue to operate Government. While we debate the differences we have in this bill, we will pass this simple bill and say America is paying for its Government, and we are going to deliver it.

Mr. Speaker, we could pass this simple little resolution in 5 minutes. We have already passed one twice. We will take the figures that our Republican colleagues put in their resolution last time and simply say, Let us go to January 3 or 17 or 29, and then let us try to figure out, as adults, as responsible Americans sent here to represent our fellow citizens, how do we resolve the differences in this bill? But it is the failure to pass this one that has shut down parts of Government. That brings no credit to us or to this institution.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I realize there is a great deal of concern on the part of my Democrat colleagues regarding this debate and vote. They say the President's budget is not really a budget, it is more like a plan or a proposal or an internal working document. In any case, they say that we should not be voting on it, whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the agriculture title of the President's budget is very real. There are 187 pages of specific policy recommendations from the Office of Management and Budget. Just for the record, when specific and real budgets were presented by Republican Presidents in the past years, the Democratic majority made it a regular ritual to call for a vote and to put everybody on the record, so today it is no different.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of the welcome and helpful efforts of various Democrats, those who call themselves the Blue Dogs, those who are part of the coalition group, this document right here really contains the only current and specific policy recommendations on agriculture by this administration.

What are the proposals for farm country? Well, farmers are not freed from massive USDA regulation. The Secretary of Agriculture is given broad authority to arbitrarily establish mandatory land set-asides. The budget that the President vetoed deregulates all of that practice.

The President revives the off-farm income means test for farm programs that calls for farmers and ranchers to surrender their income tax return to the Department. That is the very reason the House overwhelmingly rejected this idea earlier this year.

Marketing loans and other programs that farmers file for all year are wrecked by the President's plan for cotton, rice, and peanuts.

Sugar farmers do not have that problem. The President simply eliminates their program after 2 years, with no mechanism to ease the transition.

There are new taxes in the form of user fees and assessments. They are levied on producers to finance marketing orders and the peanut program. There is a new tax levied on the crop protection industry.

Assessments on dairy farmers are retained and the scheduled decrease is canceled. All Republican dairy proposals are premised on eliminating the assessments entirely.

The bulk of the agriculture savings in the President's budget comes from increasing the acres for which no payments will be made. That is a straight cut in income support. There is no protection against any future budget cuts though deregulation; no effort to help farmers make an assisted transition to

market-oriented farming. The President offers farmers cuts in income, more cuts to come, and the status quo.

The President has stressed how important it is to protect farmers in this budget process; that cuts in ag should be limited to \$5 billion instead of the \$12 billion in the balanced budget that he vetoed. But the crucial issue is how much help farmers will get, not about how much is cut.

The budget he vetoed contained \$44 billion as an investment in farm program reform over 7 years. The President's budget contains only \$37 billion. I want to make it very clear to those who care about the future of American agriculture what is at stake in this debate. If we can bring the Federal budget into balance, interest rates will fall, and farmers who are among the heaviest users of credit in this country will save \$15 billion in borrowing costs.

If we fail in this task, if we fail, if we delay, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, has warned that interest rates will sharply rise, heavily impacting farmers. The longer we delay, the worse agriculture will fare in this budget process as we struggle with a collapsing baseline.

My colleagues, America needs a balanced budget bill that will really balance the budget. The President has vetoed one serious budget effort. We need to send a strong signal to the President that a status quo ag policy that does not preserve an adequate investment in agriculture is a nonstarter. Let us renew our efforts for a budget plan that truly balances the budget and treats our farmers fairly.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the last 30 days or so, I have really started to worry about whether I am in the right place. I am worried about whether we are following somebody who has any sense of responsibility to the American people.

A Speaker who would close down the Government because he had to get off the back of a plane; a Speaker who would lead us to default on the obligations that the U.S. Government has to people that it owes money to; a Speaker that would close down the Government 2 or 3 days before the Christmas holiday.

Yet, we spend our time dealing with trivia that has no meaning, like this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what is happening here today. I am afraid that our government has been taken hostage by a

stubborn gang of right-wingers, left-wingers, and campaign consultants.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this budget disagreement is a serious debate about real issues and the future of our country. This fight is about principles. But sooner or later, the public interest requires that even principled fighters settle on something.

I have done a little research back in my office. I first consulted my Bible, and I learned that Moses went up on that mountain and came down with the Ten Commandments 40 days later. I consulted the Bicentennial edition of the U.S. Constitution and I learned that the Founders wrote the Constitution of the United States of America in less than 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in session since January. That is 350 days. That is 12 months. That is a year. Now we have shut down the Government twice, and still have not finished our work.

Mr. Speaker, I say the President and the Republican leadership ought to put their plans on the table and come to a compromise. If they cannot agree on how to run the Government, then they ought to put the coalition budget on the table and go from there. The coalition plan is not perfect, but I think that if Moses or the Founders or the American people could have their say, they would give them the same advice.

Mr. Speaker, if some politicians think it is in their interest to continue this posturing and carry this debate into the 1996 elections, then I hope the electorate will send us some good old-fashioned, practical Americans.

□ 1630

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity on the eve of those people that are able to celebrate the birth of Christ and their own religious holidays to realize that what we are doing today has nothing to do with balancing the budget. All of the things that my Republican friends are talking about can and should be done. As a matter of fact, it should have been done a long time ago.

It is one thing to hold the President of the United States hostage, to force him to do what you would want him to do by closing down the Government. It is another thing to take the American people who have nothing to do with the dilemma we find ourselves in and to say, you are not going to vote for a continuing resolution until you make them suffer the pain, until you make certain that those that have a responsibility to take care of their family are now just going to be angry with government in general.

If my colleagues really believe that these mean-spirited tactics are going to make their party and their Speaker popular, then why do they not talk with the people that have the responsibility of providing the care to the poor and to the sick, talk with the

Catholic bishops who say that these programs make no sense, the nuns and the women and the teachers and the doctors that provide for those people that even our Lord said are the lesser among us, that we would have their budgets cut, for what? To balance the budget?

Do we balance a budget really by starting off saying that we are going to give \$245 billion to the richest Americans? My colleagues, do not do it. So play around with Democrats and Republicans. Do what we have to do for the Presidential election. But as we go into the celebration of the birth of Christ, do not take these holidays and play politics with the American people.

People cannot even go to the Statue of Liberty, a place that is symbolic for what this country stands for, and we are down here just playing politics without allowing Government to continue.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the first budget the President submitted this year and stated so in the Committee on the Budget because it did not do what I want done, and that is balance the budget in 7 years.

I opposed his second budget but applauded him for moving into the 10-year balanced budget frame. I applauded the President when he moved again a week ago, not as far as I would like to see, and I certainly will vote against this so-called budget today, which really is not a budget. It is an opportunity to talk about whatever it is we have been talking about.

But I also voted against the Republican budget. We hear a lot about the deficit. And I have a lot of agreements with the Republican budget. I think we will find whenever we can start negotiating that we will have some agreements. I have a lot of strong disagreements. The biggest one is I do not believe it makes sense to borrow 53 billion more dollars over the next 3 years in order to give ourselves a tax cut.

If my colleagues are concerned about deficits, it seems to me that the good-faith first effort ought to be reduce the deficit, not cut taxes.

We talk about negotiations. I have not seen any movement on this as yet. Does it really make sense to borrow 53 billion more dollars when we are talking about reducing the deficit? I ask my colleagues to justify that one.

We have heard a lot about honest numbers. Again let me repeat, honest numbers, real numbers, CBO, all of this that I support, but CBO adjusted their real, honest numbers 135 billion since we started the fussing.

I am on the nonnegotiating team. I hope today as our leaders have met, I hope that later today we will hear that the negotiators can sit down and start working out the differences between

the various ideas and that we come to an agreement, and that budget agreement will be signed by the President because he has said, I will sign a 7-year CBO-scored budget. But we will not get there with what we are doing this afternoon.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Clinton's unbalanced budget and in support of the balanced budget that has already passed this Congress.

The President has now had four tries at sending the Congress a balanced budget. And, he still has not gotten close to honoring the commitment he made to the American people and the law he signed 29 days ago agreeing to a balanced budget in 7 years using real numbers, not smoke and mirrors. President Clinton's latest budget keeps piling on the debt—an estimated \$265 billion in the red.

While the President cannot send us a budget that actually balances, he can stand over at the White House and scare our seniors, scare our families, and scare our veterans with dire rhetoric and self-serving political posturing that lacks one essential element—the truth.

The President has his seasons mixed up. It is Christmas, not Halloween. So maybe he should put away the "senior-scare" tactics and "bogey-man" budgets and join the Congress in actually helping our Nation by balancing the budget.

Today, each and every member of Congress faces a crystal clear decision. Members can vote for President Clinton's fourth budget and with their vote they will say to their folks back home, "I agree with President Clinton. We simply don't want to balance the budget so let's not even try. Let's just keep piling on the debt that our children and grandchildren will be stuck with anyway. And, we'll keep playing the tried and true Washington political game of saying one thing and doing another. Saying we want a balanced budget, but voting to keep up the outrageous spend-a-thon." That's what some wrongheaded members might say.

Or, Members of Congress can vote "no" on President Clinton's budget. By voting "no," a Member of Congress is saying, "President Clinton, it really is time to finally balance the budget. No more Washington, DC gimmicks. No more political games. No more divisive grandstanding. Let's do the right thing. Let's balance the budget. Let's put our government back to work."

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to vote "no" and send a bipartisan message to President Clinton that we are ready to move forward to balance the budget and it is about time that he joined us.

The American people are waiting and watching.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly comment on the significant differences between the administration's recent unbalanced budget proposal and the Republican balanced budget plan.

The Republican plan stops a decade-long hemorrhage in defense spending, in the President's 5-year defense plan. We do not know how much further the President might be cutting the defense budget because his latest proposal does not provide specific budget function numbers. While the Republican defense plan is far from a cure-all, it does begin to restore quality of life for our personnel and their families. It does sustain readiness. It does begin the long and expensive process of reinvigorating a faltering modernization program, and it does initiate long overdue Pentagon reforms.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite just one important example where the President's recent proposal is not only inconsistent with the bipartisan congressional priorities but breaks faith with our military personnel.

Two years ago the President signed into law reconciliation legislation that disproportionately delayed the payment of military retiree COLA's relative to their Federal civilian counterparts. Realizing the error of his ways, the President finally requested the restoral of COLA equity in his budget submission earlier this year. The Republican balanced budget plan endorsed COLA equity. Just last Friday the House passed a fiscal year 1996 defense authorization conference report containing the statutory changes necessary to implement COLA equity.

Yet it appears that the President has had a change of heart. His most recent unbalanced budget proposal would once again unfairly penalize our military retirees by delaying payments of their COLA's to October while endorsing the payment of Federal civilian retiree COLA's to April. To use another's famous words, it is *deja vu* all over again.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman described the Republican reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the country moves on. In fact today Alan Greenspan reduced interest rates by a quarter of a percent so the country can grow at a quicker rate. Only the Government shuts down. Only we in Congress can open it. Yet while Rome burns, the leadership of the Republican Party fiddles.

Thanks to the Speaker, the Federal Government is shut down again, 250,000 employees are out of work because the Speaker's nose is out of joint. Happy holidays. Instead of passing a continuing resolution, putting people back to work and going back to the negotiating table, we are voting on a poorly plagiarized budget document.

I support a balanced budget. I support the President's commitment to do so while protecting Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment. But this is not the President's budget. This is a gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, stop wasting our time. Go back to the negotiating table and stop holding Federal employees hostage, just because the Gingrich-Kasich budget is a loser to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, what we are engaging in here tonight is in fact a charade. This is certainly a family unfriendly Congress. There is a legitimate budget on the table, that is the coalition's budget. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], for having the courage to set forth earlier in this year a very detailed, a very difficult budget that makes very difficult choices. That is what we ought to be negotiating here today, not this mindless game that we are playing here, where we are not really getting anywhere.

We are in fact holding Federal employees hostage. They are sitting out there wondering if this is in fact the way Government should work. No, it is not. Let us get serious. Let us look at the coalition budget and let us do the job that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE]. (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the honorable ranking member for his leadership on these budget issues.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we need to take this budget misrepresentation off of the congressional agenda. This is not a budget. This has not been offered by the President. We need to get rid of the \$270 billion tax cut, talk seriously about reducing the deficit, stop eliminating Medicare and Medicaid, hurting the hospitals in Houston and in Texas, stop eliminating summer jobs for our youth, stop a welfare reform plan that does not allow people to become independent, and stop the foolish ego fight that the Republican majority is engaged in. This Congress, in a bipartisan manner, should put forward an American budget that all Americans can support. This is not a time for an unneeded tax cut. It is time for a reasonable approach to get a balanced budget. This is not a time to not

accept an unnamed, unscared, and unacceptable proposal that the Republicans have without reason placed on this House floor for a vote.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this country is at war. Everyone in this Congress and people throughout America recognize that this country is at war. Mr. Speaker, this country it is at war with an issue that has the potential of wreaking more destruction on this great Nation and more hurt on the American people than any war in our history. This issue, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the budget deficit, a fact of life for every American over the last quarter century that has made products more expensive, created higher interest rates, and depressed an economy and a nation that is poised for economic boom.

Last November, the American people elected a new leadership in Washington. In doing so the American people sent to battle the troops they believed would carry the flag of responsibility and reason. The war over our economic future is a fight we cannot afford to lose—the stakes are too high.

Mr. Speaker, there are very close parallels between this Nation's national security and this budget war. Just as Americans have asked our brave sons and daughters to spend the holidays in a cold and distant land in Europe, now is the time to ask our Nation's political leaders to join the battle and balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before that "It is Morning in America." And I firmly believe that this week we are on the threshold of greatness once again. There will be no brighter dawn than the hopes and dreams made possible by a sound economy. We have an opportunity at this time to balance the budget for the first time in a quarter century and preserve the future for every American—a new dawn, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the President's call to arms. Now is the time for the President to join the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body who are willing to do all it takes to balance the budget of this great Nation.

Certainly, it will require sacrifice. Certainly, it will require tough decisions. But Mr. Speaker we must win this very important battle today if we are to balance the people's books tomorrow. Oppose the latest Clinton unbalanced budget plan and support a serious plan to reach a balanced budget by 2002.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished minority whip and my good friend.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to balance the Federal Budget.

They would like us to do it in 7 years. That is a true fact. But it is also a true fact that 75 percent of the American people reject the Republican plan. They reject cuts in Medicare. They reject cuts in Medicaid. They reject cuts in education and the environment. They reject tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America that are in the Republican proposal.

My colleagues have put their budget before the American people, and the American people have said no, that budget goes too far. But instead of sitting down and negotiating, instead of coming up with a balanced budget that protects Medicare and Medicaid, the environment, education, things that we said in the last CR we were going to protect, for the second time in less than a month, Speaker GINGRICH has closed down the government, has manufactured a crisis in an attempt to ram through the Republican budget plan.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. Blackmail did not work the first time, and it is not going to work the second time. We are not going to be forced to accept a budget that devastates seniors, the disabled, children, students, and working families all over this country.

My colleagues want to talk about priorities? Well, let us talk about the Republican tax breaks. Eighty percent, 80 percent of America, has not seen a raise in wages in the last 20 years. That is a fact. Yet over 50 percent of the tax breaks in their budget go to people making over \$100,000 a year or more. No wonder all those corporate CEO's, and the Washington Post, and the New York Times today took out a full-page ad, a full-page ad. Under the Republican plan wealthy corporations, they are going to be the biggest winners of all, and if everything is going to be on the table in this debate, then corporate welfare and corporate tax breaks have to be on the table, too.

And I say to these gentlemen here they want a balanced budget? Come on down and participate, participate. It is not fair to ask our seniors to pay more, to ask working families throughout this country to pay more, if they are not willing to ask the wealthiest corporations in America to at least do something in the way of tax expenditures and corporate welfare.

They want to talk about keeping their promises? Well, let us talk about what the Republican Medicare and Medicaid proposals do to seniors. Let us listen to what Consumer Reports has to say. Everybody knows Consumer Reports. My colleagues want to buy a TV, want to buy a car, they go to Consumer Reports, they try to get a rundown on what is a good deal. They came out with a report, and this is what they said, and I quote:

"What Congress isn't telling you: Families of nursing home residents may face financial ruin under Federal Medicaid bill."

That is what they say they do to Medicaid in their budget proposal. This report says that if the Republican budget passes, and I quote, 36 million Americans will lose Medicaid protection they have now, and an estimated 395,000 long-term care patients are likely to reduce Medicaid payments for their nursing home care next year.

Do my colleagues want to talk about keeping promises? What about all the promises we have made to our parents and to our grandparents? Their budget abandons them.

Do my colleagues want to talk about accounting gimmicks? Let us talk about years 8, 9, and 10 under their budget. Just look at what the tax breaks do, the Republican tax breaks do. They dip down in year 7, in the year 2002. What happens in years 8, 9, and 10? They explode, they go through the ceiling.

Now how are we going to pay for this? More cuts in Medicare, more cuts in Medicaid, more cuts in education.

Mr. Speaker, we all want a balanced budget, but, if we want to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, we have got to make sure that it stays balanced, and we have got to guarantee our children's future, not guarantee the future of the wealthy through these exploding tax breaks.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's budget proposal. It does not balance the budget.

By contrast, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its determination to balance the budget with real deficit reduction, not phoney numbers.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the Resources and Agriculture Committees, I know first hand that all of the Committees have worked hard to carry out their mandate for deficit reduction.

The Resources Committee has worked on the difficult task of ensuring the wise use and protection of our nation's natural resources.

Strong environmental protections are critical. There is no question here. Those of us who represent the West know first hand how important it is to protect our nation's resources. We have grown up amidst those resources and we understand the principle of "wise use."

The goal of the Resources Committee has been to restore some balance to the equation. In many of our states, the federal government owns over a third or more of the land. We are simply asking that our citizens have some say over the manner in which those lands and resources are maintained and protected.

We are also working to protect the interests of the working families whose wise use of our resources is critical to their livelihood and to our nation's future.

The Resources Committee has produced over \$2.3 billion in savings

through 2002. This will help us balance the budget and ensure a better future for our children.

All our opponents have done is complain about our plan. My question is, where is their plan? The President's budget never gets to balance.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not balance the budget, our children will pay the price. Already, a child born today will pay \$187,000 in taxes just to pay for their share of interest on the debt.

The Congress has not balanced the budget since 1969. We cannot wait any longer. Our children are depending on us to finally do the responsible thing, and end these endless deficits.

This is not easy work, it involves tough choices and tough votes. Unfortunately, the President has declined to join with us in the heavy lifting.

Last month, the President gave the Congress and the American people his word that he would submit a budget that achieves balance in seven years with real numbers. So far, he has not fulfilled his commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the reason there is conflict this week in our government is because this Congress is different. We promised the American people a balanced budget, and we are going to deliver.

The easy course would be to postpone the tough choices to a future Congress. After all, Congress has been doing this since 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this time we are not going to pass the buck. We are here, we are ready to negotiate, and we are ready to work with the President to produce the balanced budget he has promised.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Budget Committee's majority members and staff has taken it upon themselves to speak for the President of the United States and his staff by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 122. It is wrong and misleading to the public and to this body to present before this House a phoney budget which has not been issued by the President. I am distressed by this not only because it is wrong to mislead the House and the public as to the authorship of a document but also because it detracts from the real issues of this debate.

We need to address the real proposals in front of us. We do not have time to play around when 260,000 dedicated Federal workers are sitting at home, unsure if they will be paid, 6 days before Christmas. We do not have time to play around when Members are trying to get home to their families and their districts in time for the holidays. We do not have time to play around while the future of this Nation hangs in the balance.

I urge my colleagues to stop playing politics and start paying attention to the real issues here—the people—the senior citizens, veterans, students, and children who will be hurt by the current Republican budget proposals. It is time to get down to business, it is time to end this second Government shutdown and to pass a balanced budget that is good for the people of this country.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Monday the President vetoed and VA-HUD appropriations

bill. No doubt one of the reasons behind this veto was the elimination of funding for his pet program, AmeriCorps.

Most of us have served as volunteers in our local communities and never thought of being paid in the process. The AmeriCorps National Service Program is the Democrat initiative for paying people to volunteer. During the 1993 debate on the program, a senior Democrat Senator declared "Congress will not, and should not fund a program if it is unsuccessful. I do not believe it will happen but if it does I would favor cutting the program." I, and many others, question the success of AmeriCorps. After 3 years, the program has developed an average cost per volunteer between \$26,000 and \$31,000. And, one-fourth of AmeriCorps so-called volunteers don't work in their communities—they work in Government or Government funded agencies. In my opinion, this program runs contrary to the idea of selflessly giving of ones time and talents for the betterment of the greater community.

We agree with the Senior Democrat Senator who said that if a program's unsuccessful to its original goal, eliminate it. Unfortunately, it seems that President Clinton prefers to continue supporting this wasteful program.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the tactics of my Republican colleagues. Rather than trying to score political points, we should be working to balance the budget and to restore Government services to our constituents. The current shutdown is costing the American people more than \$100 million a day. It is also creating problems such as delaying benefits for our veterans and seniors.

We must protect future generations from being saddled with debt. However, the balanced budget we enact must meet several fundamental principles which have been stated by the President many times.

It must protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, veterans medical care and benefits, nutrition programs for children and the elderly, and the environment.

My Republican colleagues agreed to these same principles last month. Yet, they refuse to talk. And, they are unwilling to negotiate any significant changes to their extreme budget proposal which targets our most vulnerable citizens to give the rich a generous tax cut. They would rather see the Government close and risk default.

The President's budget, which this bill represents in name only, does not take that mean-spirited, reckless approach. It protects health care for the elderly and the disabled persons of this Nation. It also makes sure that our children receive a decent meal and a quality education in a safe environment.

The Republicans claim that the President's budget will not reach balance in 7 years. However, it may. The fact of the matter is we don't know. Seven years is a long time, and there is no way to predict with certainty what our economic growth will be over that period.

Furthermore, history teaches us that every time Republicans put their stamp on a budget deal, the deficit has ballooned. The 1990 Budget deal that President Bush signed was supposed to bring the budget to balance. It ultimately led to the highest annual deficits on record—well above \$300 billion.

The first Reagan budget also was supposed to balance the budget. It too failed miserably. In 1981, when President Reagan took office,

the national debt stood at \$1 trillion. After 12 years of Republican administrations pushing their failed economic policies, the debt skyrocketed to more than \$4 trillion.

My Republican colleagues are fond of claiming that the escalation of the national debt is the fault of the Democrats. I would remind them that Congress cut every budget request that Presidents Reagan and Bush submitted except one.

The record of President Clinton on deficit reduction is quite different. Rather than merely talking about deficit reduction, President Clinton set out on day one to address a problem he did not create but inherited from his predecessors. He did so in a fair and responsible manner, and with great success.

President Clinton's 1993 budget cut the deficit by \$700 billion. During his Presidency, the deficit has fallen 3 years in a row—that has not happened since President Harry S. Truman was in office. It now stands at the lowest level in 12 years.

We can and must build upon this progress. We should not, however, shut down the Government, break off negotiations, and bring up proposals that are invented to represent the President's budget. Sadly, this is just what the Republicans have done. Why? Because the President is unwilling to accept their extreme budget plan, or should I say their tax cut.

When it comes time to vote, I will stand with the President who has shown the American people he knows how to reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I call upon the leadership to put aside this political charade and begin the work of the people.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the fourth Clinton budget is before us.

Once again, it continues to rob our children and grandchildren because it doesn't balance.

Once again, it does not abide by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office projections.

Once again, it breaks Clinton's promise to use CBO numbers—because they're more accurate than those cooked up by White House appointees.

And once again, Mr. Speaker, a Clinton budget will lose badly on the House floor.

Bill Clinton has not told the truth about our effort to balance the budget.

The fact is, the only condition we are holding him to during the current stalemate is that he use real, honest, nonpartisan CBO numbers. That's all. He already promised to do that, both in his first State of the Union Address and in the last continuing resolution.

Those on the far left side of the aisle use the word "extremists" almost daily.

Mr. Speaker, it's not extremism to care more about the next generation than the next election.

And it's not extremism to follow through on promises like balancing the budget and saving Medicare.

The only extremism I see comes from people who don't keep their word and demagogue honest efforts to do the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight concerns I have regarding the administration's budget and its impact on agriculture. At first glance it appears the President is reducing agriculture spending much less than the Republican budget. Below, I list reasons why the Republican budget does more for agriculture than the administration's bill.

Although the administration proposes reductions in agriculture spending of \$5 billion over 7 years, as compared to \$12.3 as proposed by the Republicans, the President's proposal will spend \$37 billion over the next 7 years. This compares to \$44 billion that Republicans have budgeted over the same period. As you can see, Republicans are doing more for the American family farmer.

President Clinton wants to continue the same 60 year antiquated farm program that restricts farmers in what they plant. The Republican plan allows farmers to respond to market conditions to determine what they plant.

Also eliminated by the Republicans are land set-asides. This market distorting practice pays farmers not to plant crops in demand in the world marketplace.

The President's plan stresses high commodity prices as the only barometer of farm profitability. Surely, our self-proclaimed agriculture expert President understands that yield and other factors contribute to the farmers' bottom line. Just ask those farmers who experienced a crop failure this year, how well they like Mr. Clinton's proposal.

The sugar program is not even mentioned in the administration's budget. Under this scenario, authority to even have a sugar program would expire in 2 years.

Farmers will be freed from massive USDA regulation. No more signing up for an annual program and then returning to the local office to certify that what was planted was what he or she said they would plant. Also eliminated would be restrictions on how many acres of a particular crop could be planted.

Every congressional proposal regarding dairy eliminates farmer assessments; the administration's does not.

The President proposes means testing those with more than \$100,000 off-farm income from receiving farm payments. This may sound good, but in my Illinois district, some 75 percent of all land is owned by someone who does not farm the land. Means testing would shift farm land rents to a cash rent system where small family farmers will assume all the risk.

The President's budget will leave farmers exposed to future budget reductions, while the Republican budget will preserve agricultural spending.

In closing, the Republicans left Washington and went to rural America for input on the 1995 farm bill. Nineteen field hearings were held and four common issues consistently mentioned: First, no more land set-asides; second, give us planting flexibility; third, make the programs "user friendly"; fourth, provide certainty in payments.

In the interest of farmers, agribusiness, and rural America, I support the Republican budget proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). All time expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 412, answered "present" 5, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 869]

NAYS—412

Abercrombie Dingell
Ackerman Dixon
Allard Doggett
Andrews Dooley
Archer Doolittle
Armey Dornan
Bachus Doyle
Baesler Dreier
Baker (CA) Duncan
Baker (LA) Dunn
Baldacci Durbin
Ballenger Ehlers
Barcia Ehrlich
Barr Emerson
Barrett (NE) English
Barrett (WI) Ensign
Bartlett Eshoo
Barton Evans
Bass Everett
Bateman Ewing
Becerra Farr
Beilenson Fattah
Bentsen Fawell
Bereuter Fazio
Bevill Fields (LA)
Bilbray Fields (TX)
Bilirakis Flake
Bishop Flanagan
Bliley Foglietta
Blute Foley
Boehkert Forbes
Boehner Ford
Bonilla Fowler
Bonior Fox
Bono Frank (MA)
Borski Franks (CT)
Boucher Franks (NJ)
Brewster Frelinghuysen
Browder Frisa
Brown (CA) Frost
Brown (FL) Funderburk
Brown (OH) Furse
Brownback Gallegly
Bryant (TN) Ganske
Bryant (TX) Gejdenson
Bunn Gekas
Bunning Geren
Burr Gibbons
Burton Gilchrest
Buyer Gillmor
Callahan Gilman
Calvert Gonzalez
Camp Goodlatte
Campbell Goodling
Canady Gordon
Cardin Goss
Castle Graham
Chabot Green
Chambliss Greenwood
Chenoweth Gunderson
Christensen Gutierrez
Chrysler Gutknecht
Clay Hall (OH)
Clayton Hall (TX)
Clement Hamilton
Clinger Hancock
Coble Hansen
Coburn Harman
Collins (GA) Hastert
Collins (IL) Hastings (FL)
Collins (MI) Hastings (WA)
Combust Hayes
Condit Hayworth
Conyers Hefley
Cooley Hefner
Costello Heineman
Cox Herger
Coyne Hilleary
Cramer Hilliard
Crane Hinchey
Crapo Hobson
Cremeans Hoekstra
Cubin Hoke
Cunningham Holden
Danner Horn
Davis Hostettler
de la Garza Houghton
Deal Hoyer
DeFazio Hunter
DeLauro Hutchinson
DeLay Hyde
Dellums Inglis
Deutsch Istook
Diaz-Balart Jackson (IL)
Dickey Jackson-Lee
Dicks (TX)

Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCreery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders

Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

□ 1715

PROVIDING FOR PROVISIONAL APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS ISSUED BY OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 123), to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 123

Resolved,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS.

The regulations applicable to employing offices which are not the House of Representatives or the Senate and covered employees who are not the employees of the House of Representatives or the Senate which are to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996, are hereby approved on a provisional basis until such time as such regulations are approved in accordance with section 304(c) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384(c)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 123 is a companion resolution to House Resolution 311 that we looked at earlier in the day and accepted. House Resolution 311 applied to the House of Representatives, and the House Concurrent Resolution 123 applies to covered employee offices and others, such as the Architect, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, recall the situation in which probably a provision of rules will be passed on January 8. We probably will not be here. We will accept these provisionally. When we come back on January 23, we will examine and then approve the final orders.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. It has been a very cooperative effort on the part of the majority and the minority to develop standards and guidelines that we can all benefit from as we live with the new law that applies all of the laws that this Congress has passed to ourselves at some point during the next calendar year. I believe

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Clyburn Filner Williams
Engel Mink

NOT VOTING—16

Berman Lantos Scarborough
Chapman Murtha White
Coleman Pryce Yates
Edwards Ros-Lehtinen Young (AK)
Gephardt Rose
Kaptur Rush

□ 1711

Messrs. HILLIARD, DURBIN, BE-REUTER, RIGGS, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to my mother-in-law's death, I was unable to be present for the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 122 and, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably caught in traffic during the vote on rollcall vote 869. If I had been here, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceed-