

Spratt	Thurman	Ward
Stenholm	Torres	Waters
Stokes	Torricelli	Watt (NC)
Studds	Towns	Waxman
Stupak	Trafigant	Wise
Tanner	Velazquez	Woolsey
Tejeda	Vento	Wyden
Thompson	Visclosky	Wynn
Thornton	Volkmer	

NOT VOTING—23

Beilenson	Gutierrez	Rose
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Skaggs
Conyers	Istook	Stark
Edwards	Lantos	Weldon (PA)
Filner	Martinez	Williams
Flake	Myers	Wilson
Foglietta	Packard	Yates
Gilchrest	Payne (VA)	

□ 2028

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SKELTON and Mr. PICKETT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2030

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I was here during the entire last vote. I put my card in and pushed the button. It apparently did not record. If it would have recorded, it would have recorded a "yes" vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 134, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. ARCHER laid before the House a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence:

(The conference report on H.R. 4 will appear in a subsequent issue of the RECORD.)

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO AMEND HOUSE RESOLUTION 317

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule just passed be amended to read as follows:

It shall be also in order to consider an amendment by the minority leader or his

designee adding at the end of House Joint Resolution 134 a new title II consisting of the text of House Joint Resolution 131, continuing funds for many critical Federal departments through January 26, 1996, and authorizing a 2.4 percent pay raise for the Armed Forces of the United States. All points of order shall be waived against such an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, specifically the guideline of November 14, 1991, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Speaker to clear that request.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS TO ENSURE PAYMENTS OF VETERANS BENEFITS

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 317, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 134) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 134

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

Sec. 101. ENSURED PAYMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1996 OF VETERANS' BENEFITS IN EVENT OF LACK OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—In any case during fiscal year 1996 in which appropriations are not otherwise available for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall nevertheless ensure that—

(1) payments of existing veterans benefits are made in accordance with regular procedures and schedules and in accordance with eligibility requirements for such benefits; and

(2) payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs are made when due in the case of services provided that directly relate to patient health and safety.

(b) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payments pursuant to subsection (a), including such amounts as may be necessary for the costs of administration of such payments.

(c) CHARGING OF ACCOUNTS WHEN APPROPRIATIONS MADE.—In any case in which the Secretary uses the authority of subsection (a) to make payments, applicable accounts shall be charged for amounts so paid, and for the costs of administration of such payments, when regular appropriations become available for those purposes.

(d) EXISTING BENEFITS SPECIFIED.—For purposes of this section, existing veterans bene-

fits are benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that have been adjudicated and authorized for payment as of—

(1) December 15, 1995; or

(2) if appropriations for such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection(b)) after December 15, 1995, the last day on which appropriations for payment of such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 317, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor a continuing resolution for certain activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs. This continuing resolution would only have effect in fiscal year 1996 during periods when appropriations are otherwise not available. This is the situation we are in right now. If the regular bill or another CR is enacted, then this particular continuing resolution would not be operable.

The activities provided for in this continuing resolution are payments for compensation, pensions, and educational benefits within the Department of Veterans Affairs. In addition, it also provides for payments to contractors for services that directly relate to patient health and safety. It also provides for the necessary administrative expenses to carry out these activities.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution will assure that veterans benefits checks will be received on time, at the end of the month, and in the full amount authorized. Let me stress, had the President not vetoed the VA-HUD bill, this continuing resolution would not have been necessary and these benefits would have been paid. These benefits would have been paid and this CR would not have been necessary if the President had not vetoed the VA-HUD bill. Once again, these benefits would have been paid if the President had not vetoed the VA-HUD bill. I want everybody to understand it. He vetoed it. That is why we are here today. The President vetoed it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my friends and colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, two more points. This bill is necessary because the President vetoed the VA-HUD bill, but it would not be necessary to progress through both houses and be enacted into law if the President would, in good faith, come to the bargaining table, reach a final agreement on a 7-year balanced budget, according to Congressional

Budget Office numbers, and put this whole deal to bed and let us get out of here. But so far that is not happening. We cannot get a deal from the President, so we progress into the Christmas holidays.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind our colleagues, let me remind everyone here that the House went on record on Monday by a vote of 351 to 40 in favor of a balanced budget within 7 years as scored by the Congressional Budget Office. Yesterday, on Tuesday, the President's budget got zero votes, zero votes; none on the Republican side, none of the Democratic side. The President's budget got zero votes.

Now we are on record for a 7-year balanced budget as scored by the CBO. His budget got zero. That leaves only one alternative. That leaves the alternative of the President coming to the bargaining table with the leaders of the Congress and reaching a deal, reaching a deal that allows us to fund government, to score the budget according to the Congressional Budget Office with a balanced budget for 7 years, and to go home. I hope that happens, Mr. Speaker.

Today, today I might remind our colleagues, today we overrode his veto on the securities litigation bill. This place is not getting better for the President. He should come and cut a deal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that nobody is opposed to this bill. This bill will pass, probably 435 to nothing. Our objection is not to this proposal. Our objection is to not going beyond this proposal.

We are here because the appropriations legislation was delayed for 90 days in this House because our friends on the Republican side of the aisle wanted first to adopt their contract. That is their privilege. They are in the majority. They run the House. But as a practical consequence of that, that meant that the appropriations bills were shoved back 90 days in the cycle. That meant that there was no possible way for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] to produce all of the appropriation bills on time.

The when the bills were brought to the floor, a number of extraneous legislative items were added to the bills, and that slowed up consideration of those bills even more. That meant that by the time of October 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year, a huge number of appropriation bills had not yet become law. That and only that necessitated the passage of a continuing resolution. You do not need a continuing resolution to keep discussions going between the President and the Speaker on a 7-year budget proposal. You need a continuing resolution simply because the 1-year appropriations have not become law.

□ 2045

So tonight we have a proposition before us under which the majority party

is saying that they will not allow the remainder of the Government to reopen; since they have been closed down this week, they only want us to allow the Veterans Department to reopen, and then only for certain purposes.

Now, we think it is fine that this bill will say, OK, let us pay veterans' benefits, let us pay veterans' disability benefits, let us pay veterans' pensions, let us pay their education benefits, and also let us pay some contractors with the VA. But we would also ask the following questions:

Why should we not also allow the Veterans Department to process legitimate new claims for veterans' benefits? Some 2,000 veterans will apply each week for benefits to which they are entitled by law. Why should not the Veterans Department be open to provide those services?

Why should the Veterans Department not be open, further, to provide services for home loans? Veterans have earned the right to those home loans. Why should they not be allowed to have those claims processed?

I would also ask, why should not veterans who want to go to Yosemite be able to get in?

Why should not veterans who need education loans be able to have those processed, or to have the Pell grants open for application for everyone?

Why should we only open up the Government for a very narrow band of American citizens?

The taxpayers have paid their hard-earned money so that they might get all of the Government services to which they are entitled, and unless we go beyond this resolution tonight, they will not get those services. That is our objection.

What is happening is very clear. There was an agreement yesterday that the President and the leaders of both parties would try to reopen discussions for a 7-year budget, and at the same time, they would explore ways to open the Government for all citizens. Instead, tonight, the network news tells us because that agreement blew up in the Republican caucus, again we face the prospect of not having any continuation of services from those departments shut down.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen in the well here likes to laugh every time somebody else is speaking. I would ask him for the same courtesy I give him every time he speaks.

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

Mr. OBEY. No, I will not, until the gentleman demonstrates some degree of courtesy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin has the time, and the Chair would ask Members to extend the same courtesy to speakers when they are in the well, speaking on this bill to all Members.

Let us extend courtesy to one another.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I think what is at stake

here is that the American public is simply being held hostage to the power agenda of the new 73 freshmen who have come into this place on the Republican side of the aisle. They have a perfect right to be here and do anything they think is in the interests of their constituents, but the American citizens will judge the balance and the temperament that they bring to those efforts.

I would simply say that what we really face was summed up by my very good friend, the chairman of the committee on Appropriations [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

When the President signed the Defense appropriation bill, against my advice, because I warned him that he would then lose whatever leverage he had on the remainder of the appropriations bills, the President signed that bill for two reasons: because he wanted a bipartisan consideration of his policy in Bosnia, and because he thought that it would be taken as a sign of goodwill to our Republican friends in the majority on other appropriation items.

Instead, the following day, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said as follows:

The President is at our mercy. If the government shuts down on December 15 and 300,000 people are again out of work, most of the people going out will be his people. I think he is going to care more than we do.

Now, as everyone knows, I have a great deal of respect and affection for the chairman of this committee. We have been friends for years, and we have had a constructive working relationship for years. But I think that the leverage which other power centers in this body are bringing to bear on the appropriations process is making it very difficult for this House to do its duty to every single citizen in this country.

We have a duty not just to disagree on what we disagree upon; we also have a duty to agree on that which we can agree upon. Right now, we ought to at least be able to agree upon the idea that every citizen of this country has a right to the full range of services that he has paid for. He cannot have access to those services when the Government is shut down.

So what I ask my colleagues to do tonight is not only to support this resolution, but to support our efforts at the end of the debate in our recommittal motion to expand the services which are providing a narrow range for some veterans' programs, expand those to all veterans' programs and, indeed, all of the programs to which our citizens are entitled. If we do not do that, we are not earning our salaries; we are not providing the services which our taxpayers have a right to expect.

Forget the leverage games, forget the zeal, remember your duty; open up the entire Government for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

New York [Mr. GILMAN] the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 134, a continuing resolution to extend veterans' benefits for the month of January. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for his worthy efforts in bringing this important measure to the floor at this time.

In these days of fiscal debate and disagreement, it is crucial that we forget those who rely on us. There are millions of deserving veterans who depend upon their monthly pension or disability checks. It would be an injustice if we, in our current impasse over the budget, allow these veterans' checks, which contain a 2.6-cost-of-living adjustment, not to be processed due to a lack of authorized funds.

Our Nation's veterans answered their country's call, sacrificing their time, quite often their health. They loyally fulfilled their duty to their Nation. In this holiday season, their Nation should fulfill its obligation to them. This resolution will fulfill that obligation, even as we continue our important debate over a balanced budget.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this worthy measure designed to protect our veterans during this Government shutdown.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution for one segment of our society, one category of our citizenry is symbolic of the destructive nature of the politics of division that our Republican colleagues are practicing so successfully, but just because it is successful does not make it right.

This CR, for one group of our people over another, begins the Republican crusade to pit our American people against one another. It starts with this CR and it will end with the block grants. You will pit elderly people against poor kids. You are going to pit the veterans against children on AFDC.

Why are you not giving a CR for AFDC recipients? It is because you are making a value judgment here that veterans count more than young kids.

That is what is wrong with your approach, and that is what is wrong with your Contract With America.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] that AFDC does not require a continuing resolution.

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

Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman who just spoke that there is nothing that we can do for our children that is more important than balancing the budget. If you want to talk about pitting something against the young people of this country, then please talk about the crushing load of debt that we are transferring to them because of our selfishness. Talk about the \$187,000 in taxes that they are going to pay during their lifetime to pay for our profligacy and our unwillingness to discipline ourselves.

I say to my colleagues there is nothing more proveteran than balancing the budget. They know what it is to serve this country, and they could use the 2-percent lower interest rates that a balanced budget will mean.

One of the speakers on the other side referred to the veterans of this country, the 2.2 million veterans who are going to be affected by this resolution this evening, as a narrow band of our society. Well, 2.2 million veterans are not a narrow band, and they are the most deserving constituency in this country.

What we are doing is right, and what we are doing is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, 2.2 million veterans receiving compensation for their service-connected disabilities; 308,000 widows, children, and survivors of veterans who have died of service-connected disabilities; 450,000 veterans receiving pensions for their wartime service; and thousands of veterans receiving the Montgomery GI bill payments each month, that is no narrow band of our country.

It is a shame, it is a crying shame that what we are doing this evening is even necessary because this Congress did its business, it did its duty, it passed a VA appropriations bill, one that was good and fair to veterans, increasing veterans' spending over the next 7 years by \$40 billion more than the last 7 years at the time that the veteran population is going down.

Let us support our veterans.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why we are here just a few days before Christmas, and I hope some of the rhetoric that I am hearing around here is just that.

Let me just point out one thing. Sixty percent of the eligible voters in this country, where you hear about a mandate and a revolution, 60 percent of the eligible voters in this country sent "a pox on both our Houses." That is not a revolutionary number.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing. The gentleman talked about children. I would suspect that some of

those 275,000 or 280,000 people that are going to be out of work have children and grandchildren that are going to be impacted because their parents and their grandparents are out of work; and I would suspect that there are some veterans, whom I strongly support and take no back seat to anybody in this building, that have children and grandchildren with jobs that are going to be impacted by this shutdown of government.

I was watching television the other night, and I was watching some of the freshmen on the Republican side, which shows what kind of life I lead. But a young man from Tennessee said, we want to close the Government down. That is what we want to do, close this Government down.

What do my colleagues have against those 270,000 people that have absolutely nothing to do with this budget argument? Absolutely nothing.

Now, what we can do, we can do a resolution that lets these people go back to work, go to their jobs; and we will stay here all weekend, and my colleagues can take turns thrashing the President. Will that not serve the same purpose?

These people have absolutely nothing to do with the budget negotiations. These people have been put out of work for absolutely no reason, and I challenge anybody on this side to give me a reasonable reason why we are putting these people out of work here 3 or 4 days from Christmas when they could be shopping with their children and their grandchildren and experiencing the spirit of Christmas.

So let us get on with the continuing resolution. Let the people go back to work, and then we can continue to work on the budget.

□ 2100

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me just say, the gentleman from Wisconsin a few minutes ago, as others have, has made reference to the 73 freshmen we have on our side of the aisle, indicating that they are going off on a tangent and holding us all hostage and stopping progress on the negotiations.

Many of us have been waiting for a long, long time to head this country toward a balanced budget. I have been here 13 years. We have waited and we have waited and we have waited for that additional cadre of people who are willing to fight with us to get to a balanced budget.

We have heard all the rhetoric, all the arguments for years from the Democrat side of the aisle saying, "We're going to do it, we're going to do it, we're going to do it" but we never do it. The deficit continues to rise and rise and rise and we now have a \$5 trillion national debt.

So I would just like to say to my colleague from Wisconsin, thank God for the 73 new Republican freshmen because they speak for what we have been speaking for the past 13 years. They do not speak by themselves. They speak for all of us. We are all together on this and we are going to get the job done.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker in the well said that the most important thing we can do for our children is to give them this balanced budget.

It is a strange notion of Christmas, as you gather your children around, and you say you gave them a balanced budget. But when your children ask you what is the price to other children, you tell them the children in foster care will not be able to receive placement, children who are abused are likely not to receive placement in a safe home away from the abuse, children that need health care because their parents lost their jobs will find that not there because of your cuts in Medicaid.

They always say the children are not as cruel as adults, but they will find out how cruel it was. When you tell them the price for the other children in this Nation, they are going to say, "Shame on you, Daddy. Shame on you, that you did that to the children of this Nation." Because children do not desire to see their colleagues hurt, to see their colleagues suffer that kind of pain, but that is what your budget does and that is why it should not be accepted.

I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], who attempted to correct me, is not quite correct in his trying to correct me.

If we do not complete the work on the Labor-HHS bill, States will not get the money that they need to provide for these dependent children, and that was the point I was trying to make. In fact, the point seems to have been lost here that we are trying to make a value judgment in passing a CR for one group of Americans and not another, because we all perceive this group to have political legitimacy but the children do not. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself 15 seconds, I am concerned for all of the poor people that the gentleman from California referred to. But the point is that if he would get on the phone and talk to his colleagues on the other side of the building, so they might release their filibuster and that Labor-Health and Human Services bill that has been filibustered for the last 6 months by the Democrats in the Senate might go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker I would really like to talk about what the resolution does. I rise in support of the continuing resolution that will assure that 3 million veterans will get their benefit checks on time. Two million of the 3 million veterans are service-connected either because of wounds or because of wounds or because they were hurt in the service. Also, the service-connected will get a 2.6 percent cost of living increase in their checks.

Mr. Speaker, I have felt very strongly about this, that the Federal Government has a stronger responsibility to the persons who marched off to war and came home, or to the widows and orphans of those who did not come home. So let us vote for this veterans' resolution.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee has made the point on a number of occasions that the Labor-Health bill is held up because of a filibuster. But he never says why, the reason being, because the Republicans have put a provision on the Labor-Health bill that will make it easy to fire people, easy to get rid of people, easy to get them out of jobs. Is it not ironic that the CR that you will not allow us to pass does exactly the same thing, keeping people out of jobs? That is why the Labor-Health bill has not passed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], a distinguished member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to ensure that veterans' programs will continue to be funded in the wake of the President's recent veto. Because President Clinton vetoed H.R. 2099, the 1996 VA-HUD Appropriations bill, as has been said so many times here tonight, veterans' benefit checks will not be paid on time next month unless a short-term spending measure is passed by 8 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The President should have signed H.R. 2099 and avoided putting these benefits and services in jeopardy. However, since he did not, we in Congress must act to ensure this funding and protect the Nation's veterans.

The question has been asked a few times tonight: Why do this special thing for the veteran? I will tell why. Because if history has taught us anything, it is that the American serviceman has borne any hardship, has overcome any obstacle and has conquered any foe in the defense of liberty, justice and freedom.

I think that he and she, more than anyone, can understand our battle to balance the budget for the sake of our children and our grandchildren. We must maintain our commitment to them, and Congress is here tonight because we feel strongly that veterans' benefits must not get lost in the battle to balance the Nation's budget.

America can never really repay our veterans and we will never be able to express our feelings to our fallen soldiers, but we can act to ensure that veterans will receive the benefit checks that they have earned. Our Nation's veterans deserve nothing less. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and ensure its passage.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY]. Then I would like to get to this point at hand.

There is no veteran in this country who has exhibited bravery and courage on behalf of our Nation who did that to protect or to defend themselves. They did that to protect and defend this country and the people who live here, the women and children and senior citizens of our land who are being victimized by this budget impasse and by this Government shutdown.

So to come to the floor and say we want to honor the veterans by allowing their checks to go out, we should honor their bravery and their courage by putting this Nation's budget back in order and allowing the government to operate so that the children of these veterans, the parents and grandparents of these veterans, so that the communities that these veterans live in, can be the kind of Nation that may of them fought and gave so much for.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training, Employment and Housing of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments of my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], who said we really should be talking about what is before us. That is, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training, Employment and Housing of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I take my duty and responsibilities very seriously to the 26 million veterans.

The bill which the President vetoed was very disappointing because we had over a \$400 million increase in VA medical care. The research budget totaled \$257 million. Veterans' benefits programs funding will increase from \$36.9 billion in fiscal year 1996 to \$41.8 billion in fiscal year 2002. So during the next 7 years, more than \$275 billion will be

spent on veterans' programs, \$40 billion more than the previous 7 years. I think that is very important.

The Budget which is being attacked here all of a sudden, it fully funds the important veterans' compensation, pension programs, the GI bill, vocational rehabilitation insurance, the home loan program, and a COLA increase of 2.6 percent.

The bill that is before us will ensure the on-time payment of benefits for compensation, pension, DIC, and the GI bill. It will also ensure that contractors who supply the services directly related to patient health and safety will be paid, and it will also ensure that such services as ambulance service and contract physician coverage for emergency care will continue.

I also would like to share with my colleagues, as I witnessed the debate on the rule, I would almost caution my colleagues, my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues, that I was disappointed in some of the lack of civility shown here in the House.

No one in this Chamber by political party has a cornerstone on the concerns of veterans. Many of us in this body, when we wore the uniform, no one ever asked us were we a Republican or were we a Democrat. This is why we operate in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in a tremendous bipartisan spirit, not only in the authorizing committee but in the appropriating committee.

Here is what is going to happen here tonight. We are going to continue to play a little politics, but America will receive a message here tonight. This body will overwhelmingly support this because we believe in bipartisanship for veterans.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, of course I intend to support this bill. I was sitting in the back of the Chamber listening to the rhetoric, and some of it rather fiery and some of it rather tough, and here in this season, the season supposed to be that of good will and peace, and I think that we lack that element here in this whole debate, that of good will.

I hope that in the days ahead, not just for this body, a very special revered body in this country, but for the people back home, that we reexamine and have good will and work together and get the people's work done.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of good will, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, Insurance and Memorial Affairs of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's veterans deserve better treatment than they

have received from this President. President Clinton alone bears responsibility for the Government shutdown, since he vetoed the Veterans Administration appropriations bill earlier this week. This is a good bill. It added \$400 million above last year's VA health care budget and increased overall VA spending while most departments of government face cuts.

Mr. Clinton had a choice to put veterans first. Instead, he put tree-huggers first. In his statement today, President Clinton spoke of protecting Medicare. He is going to leave saving Medicare to Republicans. Medicaid, education, and the environment. True to his principles, Mr. Clinton left out out Nation's veterans. He has lavished funding on his priorities, the paid volunteer AmeriCorps boondoggle, a Bosnian occupation, jet-setting Cabinet members, and a host of failed liberal social programs.

But, sadly, the President has chosen to play politics with our Nation's veterans and to jeopardize the balanced budget which benefits our Nation and all Americans. Our bill corrects this. Rather than shortcutting our Nation's veterans as the President was willing to accept, this bill ensures that payment to some 3 million veterans and their dependents will continue to be made on schedule.

Despite the utter lack of this President's leadership, Congress will look out for those who have worn our Nation's uniform. Though this President has avoided the tough choices required in restoring fiscal sanity needed to support our veterans, we will ensure their protection. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

□ 2115

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

I was in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA], my colleague, a couple of months ago. We were traveling with some hospital administrators in our area who were telling senior citizens the impact in a non-partisan way. Many of them were Republicans. They were telling the senior citizens about the impact of the Republican cuts in Medicare and Medicaid on their hospitals. They were telling them in their own words. We did not coach them.

At the end of it this exsteelworker looked up at me with a big broad smile that turned into a very sad face, and he actually started to cry. And I said, What is the matter? He said, You know, I have never asked this country for much of anything. I laid in the snow and I laid in the mud and the rain for 5 years in Europe. I was not wounded. I was one of the the fortunate ones. I never asked this country for anything except keep its promise to me. Give me Medicare and Medicaid, if I need it. Do not make my children have to give up educating my grandchildren because

they have to pick up the bill because we no longer prohibit that sort of thing to occur.

He was very sad. So I am glad that we are taking care of the veterans with this rifle shot CR. But there are so many things that we are doing that is hurting those same veterans. We are balancing the budget on their backs and they are being asked to fight again.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of House Joint Resolution 134—a bill to ensure that our Nation's veterans receive their compensation checks during this shutdown.

I am firmly committed to balancing our Nation's budget, but our veterans are innocent victims of this shutdown.

Those who have risked their lives and liberty in service of this Nation—those who depend on the monthly benefits that our Federal Government has contracted to give them—should not be cut off at any time.

For all of us, this should be an easy vote. It would be immoral to turn our backs on our veterans.

That said—I must say one thing. Let there be no mistake about it.

This budget fight might be ugly—but the Republicans in Congress are waging this fight to preserve the strength and integrity of this Nation.

As a veteran myself, I cannot sit back and watch our Nation become weaker—racking up trillions of dollars in debt.

I hope and believe that other veterans throughout this great Nation agree with me.

Congress must—for once—exercise some fiscal discipline.

Meanwhile, we will provide for those who have served this Nation.

I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Education, Training, Employment, and Housing of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am ashamed to hear the staging and profiling by too many of my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle proclaiming their love for our veterans.

Where were they when the President needed them for resources for hospitals and medical care? He had to veto the VA-HUD bill and in his message he told them why he was doing it. They refused to support him for hospital resources for veterans.

Besides that, where were they when the Republican-appointed Clerk just fired a veteran of 23 years who helped to install the electronic voting system for this House? A veteran who served in Vietnam, who was fired without cause, they just kicked him out before Christmas without cause. They just let go a

veteran who served in Vietnam and told him they did not care about him or his family.

With friends like you, the veterans do not need any enemies.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, wondering whether the preceding speaker voted for the defense appropriations bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], a distinguished member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse fully the remarks made in a bipartisan fashion by the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Indiana. I, too, yearn for a return to civility, which is why I listened with great interest when my friend, the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, chose to attack me personally.

Mr. Speaker, I think it must be forgiven when a web of fiction is so intricately weaved and pronounced here on the floor of this House that quite often it is my natural reaction to chuckle. If a smile or a chuckle at the absurdity is inappropriate, well, then I suppose I am guilty of having a sense of humor, but a sense of humor born of the fact that we have to laugh to keep from crying. Because once again, Members of the minority get up with a straight face and they ignore reality.

The President of the United States vetoed veterans appropriations that were genuine increases in spending, \$400 million over last year, fact. And the fact is that this new majority, working in concert with responsible Members of the minority, will pass this overwhelmingly. I dare say that was the one remark given by the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations that I can agree with. This legislation will pass overwhelmingly because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], former chairman of this committee, who would like to speak to the issue of veterans benefits.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply comment on the comments of the previous speaker who addressed himself to something I said on the floor.

I would simply note, I have observed him on three occasions this week sitting in the front row of the Chamber and loudly laughing at whoever it was who was speaking at the moment, disrupting their ability to speak. I think the House deserves better conduct than that from any Member.

I would also make the point, if we want to talk about fiction, I would make the point that it was solid fact when we stated earlier in the day, and when I stated in that same statement, that the bill for veterans funding, for veterans health care was \$213 million below the amount that the bill was when it left the House.

That conference report contained a billion and a half dollars more in total funding, and yet they managed to cut the veterans funding by \$213 million.

The gentleman may feel that that is an adequate level of funding. That is his prerogative. I happen to honestly disagree. It would be nice if we could honestly disagree without constantly demonstrating physical disrespect for each other.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, good people can disagree. Good people can disagree about a great many subjects. But when repeated fiction is stated on the floor of this House, it is sad.

Once again, the ranking member has chosen to personally attack this Member of the Congress. I just simply want to say that it is shameful that these people would rather engage in shenanigans than to confront the problems we have today.

Once again, I reach out my hand to the minority side and indeed to the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Let us reason together and solve America's problems.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MURTHA], a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I wanted to point out to the Members that I think is so important in the recommittal motion that we had, and this may not be the right time and I know the Members that voted for the authorization feel that they have taken care of the two problems that we have in this recommittal motion, but in this recommittal motion we have language which will take care of the disparity in the COLA between the military retiree and the civilian retiree. We think that is important. We also have in this legislation to take care of the increase in pay for the military.

Now, I know the President is going to veto the bill. I know it passed by a slight majority in the Senate. As I understand it, the majority leader on the other side may add this to their bill at some point, but I just want the Members to realize, this is something that has to be done by the first of the year. If we do not take care of it, if we do not put this type of language in one of our appropriations bills, if the authorization is vetoed, then it means that the members of the armed services would not get their first month's increase or whatever increase it was or the COLA disparity would continue.

For 3 years the Subcommittee on National Security has taken care of the COLA disparity. We put the money in, even though it was forced on the authorization. So I would hope as the Members vote they think about this one particular provision in this recommittal. It is a very simple provision that takes care of those two things.

As I say, since the authorization has not been vetoed at this point, my colleagues may feel that this is not the time to do it, but at some point we have to do this. I would hope that the majority would recognize this so we could get it done before the first of the year.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one person who stands between a balanced budget in this town and that is the President of the United States because he vetoed the balanced budget. There is only one person that stands between those employees of the Commerce and Justice Department being at work, and that is the gentleman who vetoed that bill, the appropriations that would have paid their wages. That is the President of the United States.

There is only one person that stands between the national parks being open and the people who work for the Department of Interior, and that is the gentleman who vetoed that appropriation bill, the President of the United States. There is only one person who stands between those who work for VA and HUD and besides there would have been a 2.4-percent increase for our military had this bill been approved, and that is the President of the United States, the man who vetoed the appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading the other day in Reader's Digest a quote that I think fits this area, this time very well. It was by the late Harry Truman. He said, it is not the hand that signs the laws that holds the destiny of America; it is the hand that cast the ballot.

I think that we could say the same here. It is not the hand that vetoes the laws that holds the destiny of America; it is the hand that casts the ballot.

I urge support of this continuing resolution to fund the benefits of our veterans.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

The untold story of the Gingrich budget process is that this Congress simply did not get its work done on time. Thirteen appropriations bills were supposed to be completed by October 1. Not one of them was signed by the President into law by that deadline.

This Congress has been badly run, poorly administered, extreme and radical. That is why we now have this absurd Government shutdown.

The other reason American taxpayers have had to bear this ridiculous Gingrich Government shutdown is that the Speaker personally threatened over and over and over to shut down the

Government so he could have his way to have a massive shift of money and resources from the poor and from the middle class to give to the rich; Medicare cuts so we could have tax breaks for the rich; student loan cuts so we could have tax breaks for the largest corporations in this country; education and environmental cuts so we could have tax breaks for billionaires who renounce their citizenship.

It is wrong, and the Gingrich Republicans know it is wrong.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I get confused. Is this the same President that went on TV tonight and said, after vetoing the VA appropriations bill, we are going to delay veterans benefits?

□ 2130

Is this the same President that I recall that cooked with the other side a bill to delay military COLA's for months and months and would permanently have to reinstate it? Is this the same President that proposes better benefits for a volunteer program, a new volunteer program, than he does for our veterans? Is this the same President—I keep getting confused—who proposes better benefits for welfare recipients than our veterans? My goodness, am I confused. Is this the same President who offers better and cooked with the other side better benefits for illegal aliens who wash up on the shore and have never served the country? Is this the same President who just a few weeks ago threatened to veto the appropriations bill until he was going to send our troops into Bosnia? I get confused. Is this the same President that my colleagues have said he, as a candidate, he was going to have a plan, and he would get elected, and he would have a plan to balance the budget in 5 years? I get confused. Is this the same President who called the 73 freshmen extremists, the businessmen and women, people who have worked for a honest living and come to this place to straighten up its messed-up finances?

Now who do my colleagues believe? I am telling my colleagues that there are over 230 of us who are prepared to stay here until Washington, or whatever, freezes over, until we get a balanced budget and until we treat our veterans right.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Needless to say by the previous speaker's antics, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are mired in confusion for they believe that they have the moral high ground, and yet I find them someplace that we would not want to proceed.

The American people know where the trouble is. They realize that the President of the United States stands with opportunity. They also realize that

there was a Congress here some years ago, a Democratic Congress with two Republican Presidents, and they recognize that there was great dispute on the budget, and under Reagan there was no historic shutdown, under Bush there was no long, extended shutdown.

So, Mr. Speaker, we realize that politics of Republicans is to bring the country to its knees. The people realize that the Democrats offered to increase the pay of those in Bosnia; the Republicans rejected it. They realize that we can have a clean continuing resolution, and the Republicans rejected it so that we cannot keep this Government open. They realize that disabled children will not have their benefits because of the Republicans.

This is not about the President of the United States. This is about no moral leadership with the Republicans.

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear earlier the question from the other side, of the wonderment from the other side, that we would actually prioritize a particular rifle-shot continuing resolution for veterans, that we should not somehow be putting them at the top priority, and I just want to remind my friends on both sides of the aisle that, if there is one group that we ought to, for heaven's sakes, prioritize as being No. 1, that we should take care of without any question before, yes clearly before we take care of other groups in our society, those are veterans.

Think about the veterans who have spilled blood and are now on a pension, and think about that veteran's widow, that veteran's children. Why on Earth would it come as a surprise, why would it even be an issue? Where would the question ever come from?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Cleveland, but I would like to ask him the question, "If you truly want to serve the veterans of this country, would you vote with me to pass the VA-HUD-EPA bill with the amendments that we have been trying to offer in the committee?"

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I did vote for the VA-HUD appropriations bill that was passed in this House that was vetoed by the President of the United States 2 days ago. I vote for it proudly. We would not be here tonight, we would not be doing this tonight, had the President not vetoed that bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOKE. No. I will not yield, but I will yield at the end if I have time.

Clearly what disturbs me is that there would be a question as to why we would be here this evening to prioritize the needs of the Nation's veterans. It seems to me absolutely and utterly ap-

propriate that we would do that, and it is only a very mean-spirited, very extreme liberal agenda that would not put that first.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing wrong with putting veterans at the head of a line. We ought to put all of the veterans at the head of the line. What is wrong with making available Government services so that new veterans who are entitled to housing benefits, who are entitled to disability benefits, who are entitled to pensions; why do we not handle this resolution tonight so they can also get the services they need in order to get the aid that they have a right to expect from their Government? Why are our colleagues shutting the Government down to them and only opening it to people who already have those benefits?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, listening to this debate tonight reminded me of when I was a small child. In the Catholic school I attended there was a framed picture on the wall, and it said, "Suffer little children and come unto me." I could not understand it. I asked by parents and teacher who would want children to suffer, and then it was explained to me that the third or fourth meaning of suffer was permit, allow, children to come unto me.

Listening to our colleagues exclude children from this continuing resolution goes to the first meaning of suffer little children, to hear our colleagues come to the well and say that they have to have it this way, only the veterans.

By the way, I agree that the question here tonight is not why should we be doing this for the veterans. Of course we should. The question really is why should we not be doing it for children and others as well? But to hear our colleagues come to the well and say they are doing this so their children do not have to pay interest on the national debt 20 years from now, some children do not have anything to eat 20 minutes from now.

The message is very clear, Republican majority: Suffer, little children.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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 thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding me the time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution to get payment to our Nation's veterans. They have sacrificed for our country, they have laid their lives on the line, and this is a very important continuing

resolution, and those on the other side of the aisle who pointed out that there are a number of other things that need to be resolved, they are absolutely right as well. As a matter of fact, there are a number of things that should be taken care of, and we pointed out on our side that many of them would have been taken care of if the President had signed into law the veterans appropriations, the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations, the Commerce Department appropriations, and State Department appropriations, the Justice Department appropriations, the Interior Department appropriations. But this week he vetoed every single one of those appropriation measures and has effectively closed down all of those agencies except for essential personnel.

Now the President of the United States has a constitutional right to veto every single one of those pieces of legislation, but he also has a moral obligation and an obligation based on the law he signed over 30 days ago to balance the budget in 7 years using real numbers, to come forward with his itemized response to everything he does not like in each one of those appropriations bills, in each one of the entitlement measures we have in the country, so that we can sit down with him and negotiate. It is time to stop name calling, it is time to get down and negotiate, but we have got to have a reasonable, responsible approach to do that, and both parties laying their cards on the table, and everybody sitting down and getting serious about this is exactly what is needed, and I call upon everybody, including the President of the United States, to stop the press conferences and start negotiating.

Mr. FAZIO of California. 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, I am glad to follow the last speaker, because I hope we would put our cards on the table, and if the other side would do it and say, OK, let us take that tax cut off the table, \$245 billion, \$200 billion, we would not have to be worried about keeping the checks going to our veterans or veterans' widows.

I had the opportunity tonight to talk to a widow of a veteran. She said she could not pay for her food, she could not pay for her utilities unless her check is there, and I am glad we are at least dealing with that.

The reason we are here though is because this bill, the VA-HUD bill, was rejected by this Congress I do not know how many times because of the 20-percent cut in HUD, cuts in veterans' programs, cuts in lots of programs, and that is why we are here tonight on a stopgap measure.

I hope we pass this, but let us remember the reason we are here is because the majority could not pass these

bills by October 1, not because the President vetoed it, because they could not pass them, and now they are having to take care of it on this. I would hope we would take care of our veterans, but I hope we would also be able to take care of those who need housing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding this time to me.

As my colleagues know, I hear a lot of partisan finger pointing tonight, but this is not about Democrats, it is not about Republicans. It is about veterans. Do my colleagues want to help those who have helped us? Do my colleagues want to honor what they have done for us in the past?

Samuel Johnson said we should always remember our forefathers and our future generations, but, more importantly, we should remember the sacrifices of the former on behalf of the latter, and that is what we are doing tonight. We are remembering our veterans.

Now I would say to the gentlewoman from San Francisco, CA [Ms. PELOSI] we are not forgetting our children, we are certainly not forgetting the children. Our colleagues are going to give them a \$5 trillion debt when they are through with their left-wing spending policies. If a child is born today, he or she owes \$187,000 as his or her part of interest on the national debt over a 75-year working period of time. That is \$187,000 above and beyond local, State, and Federal taxes. I say to my colleague, "Boy, you have not forgotten the children, I must say, and I tell you what. If that's your idea of compassion, that's your idea of caring, if that's your idea of a great Christmas present, fast forward me and my kids to groundhog day."

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my concern and dismay that we must be here tonight to debate this mini CR. As we all know, this work should have been completed months ago.

As we work tonight to ensure that our veterans receive the benefit checks they so deserve, I cannot help thinking about the over 250,000 federal employees who are sitting in their homes, wondering and worrying about their fate and wondering if we care.

Christmas is 5 days away. Yet the radical new Majority refuses to find a way to solve this budget impasse, and insists on holding hardworking federal workers—and their families—hostage to their misguided and unfair budget priorities.

Let us stop the nonsense. Let us open the entire government. And let us finish our work so Federal employees can do their work.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I only have one more speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

□ 2145

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain why we have problems with this bill. It is certainly not that this bill provides benefits for veterans. The problem with this bill is that it is shortsighted and insufficient. If we do not pass a continuing resolution by December 22, this Friday, 13 million welfare checks cannot be processed by the Department of Health and Human Services. Are we going to pass a specific continuing resolution for welfare checks? I think not. But they cannot be processed if we do not have a CR by December 22. If we do not have a continuing resolution by next Wednesday, \$11 million in checks cannot be sent to the States by the Medicaid program. The States cannot function without that \$11 billion in Medicaid programs.

Between votes I checked my message machine. I just want to share with you a little message that was on it. It said: "Please tell Congressman MORAN that we veterans have been hungry before, we veterans have been cold before, but we veterans have never put our interests ahead of the country's interests before." He said: "As far as I am concerned, I do not want my benefit check until women and children get their checks first."

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

Mr. Speaker, let me take this time to point out that the recommit motion that I will offer would simply do everything that the motion before us purports to do. Our motion would open up the government for all of the veterans services described in the motion before us. We would add to that all other services to be provided, that could be provided by the Veterans Department, so the Veterans Department is open for all programs, for servicing all programs. We would expand that to provide, in fact, a clean CR through January 26 for all other functions of government, and we would at the same time authorize the 2.4 percent military pay raise for our servicemen and eliminate the 6-month disparity between COLA payment dates for military and civilian retirees, so we can assure that our military personnel will in fact be treated fairly, and will in fact receive their full COLA.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, the authorization bill is expected to be vetoed. Without this language, we can, therefore, not guarantee our troops going to Bosnia that they will have the full COLA. We think we ought to do

that and, most fundamentally, we think we ought to open all of the services of government because the taxpayers have paid for those services and they are entitled to receive them.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of arguments on this joint resolution. I am not sure they were in opposition to it, because it appears that everybody is going to vote for this bill. Some of the arguments were, "We are not doing enough." Well, if the President had not vetoed the last three appropriations bills we sent him, we would be doing a heck of a lot more than we have done so far. The fact is, as was said in the well, the President has vetoed the Justice Department appropriation, the Commerce Department appropriation, the State Department appropriation, the Interior Department appropriation, the VA-HUD appropriation, the Judiciary appropriation, and the NASA appropriation. He has vetoed all of those in the last week. All the people that work for those agencies could have gone back to work and been paid. All of the benefits that accrue under those bills could have gone into effect if the President simply signed these bills. And for all of those people who say they are concerned about children, for crying out loud, do not direct your concern at us. Tell those people, your counterparts in the other body that filibustering the Labor-Health and Human Services bill in the Senate. It has been there for five months. It is about time to move that bill.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it would be real nice if they would all of a sudden lift that filibuster, and we could dispose of it through a conference report, send it to the President, and maybe he might sign that bill and maybe he might not. Listening to his messages that we hear on television day after day about the Republicans being extremists, I get a little confused, as the gentleman from Florida earlier pointed out. Who is on first base here?

It is about time he starts getting the message. The Republican message is we want a balanced budget in 7 years, 2002. That is the only message. The rest of it is just quibbling about details. But the President has said on various times, "I am for a 5-year balanced budget, I am for a 10-year balanced budget, I am for a 9-year balanced budget, I am for an 8-year balanced budget, and yes, I am even for a 7-year balanced budget, but not that 7-year balanced budget." He does not have any details. He has come to us, he has given us, one after another, budgets that were imbalanced year after year after year, and he has not come to the table and bargained in good faith to give us what we are asking for, a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It may not cover everything we want, but it is a start. It gives the veterans the benefit payments that they need, and

hopefully, if the President comes to the table, we can take care of the rest of the unfunded activities as well.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution to make sure that veterans receive their checks on time at the end of this month. There is no doubt that this Congress is concerned about our veterans. It is clear that this continuing resolution is important and I will vote for it.

However, I must say that there is no reason why we can't pass a continuing resolution to keep the rest of the Government operating.

More than a quarter of a million Federal workers who have been furloughed are important, too. They have families. They have children. Federal workers matter.

Any yet the Republicans in this Congress refuse to pass a continuing resolution to keep our Government open because they want to force the President to accept their extreme agenda.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent to Congress to do the work of the people. We know what we need to do—pass a responsible budget that protects seniors, protects children, protects veterans, and sends our federal employees back to work.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the partisan fighting. Let's get our work done and let's give the American people the best Christmas presents they could ask for—a holiday they can spend with their families and a Government that can work together to solve this budget crisis.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 134, legislation to ensure that veterans, dependents, and survivors will continue to receive their well-earned benefits during this Government shutdown.

I would like to recognize the dedicated efforts of TIM HUTCHINSON, who has been a tireless advocate for veterans and has introduced legislation to ensure that veterans receive the compensation they deserve even when the Government is closed. I would also like to thank Chairman STUMP and Ranking Member MONTGOMERY for their tireless work on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation should never have been necessary. This week, the President had an opportunity to sign the VA-HUD appropriations bill, which would have secured the funding for veterans benefits. Instead, he vetoed it. President Clinton also has the unilateral authority to order the delivery of veterans' benefits during a Government shutdown. But he has not used it. Because of the administration's insistence on playing partisan politics with veterans, the livelihood of 3.3 million veterans, dependents and survivors is in jeopardy.

No one in this country has a greater claim to his Nation's Treasury than veterans who have been disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces and the survivors of those who made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives in the defense of our Nation. Keeping faith with these heroes, their widows and their orphans—whatever our Nation's fiscal circumstance—is as important as anything we do in Congress.

We must do what we can to guarantee that these brave men and women, who answered the call to duty and were willing to put their lives on the line in defense of their country, will receive what they deserve. This bill does that.

Our veterans deserve better than to be sacrificed at the altar of partisan politics. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, which will put veterans ahead of politics.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 317, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the minority leader, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. At this point, in its present form, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

SEC. 101. ENSURED PAYMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1996 OF VETERANS' BENEFITS IN EVENT OF LACK OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—In any case during fiscal year 1996 in which appropriations are not otherwise available for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall nevertheless ensure that—

(1) payments of existing veterans benefits are made in accordance with regular procedures and schedules and in accordance with eligibility requirements for such benefits; and

(2) payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs are made when due in the case of services provided that directly relate to patient health and safety.

(b) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payments pursuant to subsection (a), including such amounts as may be necessary for the costs of administration of such payments.

(c) CHARGING OF ACCOUNTS WHEN APPROPRIATIONS MADE.—In any case in which the Secretary uses the authority of subsection (a) to make payments, applicable accounts shall be charged for amounts so paid, and for the costs of administration of such payments, when regular appropriations become available for those purposes.

(d) EXISTING BENEFITS SPECIFIED.—For purposes of this section, existing veterans benefits are benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that have been adjudicated and authorized for payment as of—

(1) December 15, 1995; or

(2) if appropriations for such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)) after December 15, 1995, the last day on which appropriations for payment of such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)).

SEC. 102 FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 106(c) of Public Law 104-56 is amended by striking "December 15, 1995" and inserting "January 26, 1996".

SEC. 103. MILITARY PAY RAISE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) **WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.**—Any adjustment required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in elements of compensation of members of the uniformed services to become effective during fiscal year 1996 shall not be made.

(b) **INCREASE IN BASIC PAY AND BAS.**—Effective on January 1, 1996, the rates of basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence of members of the uniformed services are increased by 2.4 percent.

(c) **INCREASE IN BAQ.**—Effective on January 1, 1996, the rates of basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services are increased by 5.2 percent.

SEC. 104 ELIMINATION OF DISPARITY BETWEEN EFFECTIVE DATES FOR MILITARY AND CIVILIAN RETIREE COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The fiscal year 1996 increase in military retired pay shall (notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of section 1401a(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code) first be payable as part of such retired pay for the month of March 1996.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of subsection (a):

(1) The term "fiscal year 1996 increased in military retired pay" means the increase in retired pay that, pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, becomes effective on December 1, 1995.

(2) The Term "retired pay" includes retainer pay.

(c) **FINANCING.**—The Secretary of Defense shall transfer, from any other funds made available to the Department of Defense, such sums as may be necessary for payment to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund solely for the purpose of offsetting the estimated increase in outlays to be made from such Fund in fiscal year 1996 by reason of the provisions of subsection (a). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the transfer authority made available to the Secretary in Public Law 104-61 or any other law shall be increased by the amounts required to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to explain the amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman would explain which motion to recommit he is talking about.

Mr. OBEY. No. 1.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved on the motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the purpose of this motion is quite clear. As I said earlier, this motion would in-

corporate the provisions of the Veterans Department which are included in the original legislation before us. We would open up the Government for those services, but we would add to that the following: We would add all remaining services to be provided by the Veterans Department.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my point of order.

Mr. OBEY. We would also add all other remaining functions of the Government which have been closed down up until now. We would also, as I said, guarantee that the military receive their 2.5 percent pay raise, and correct the differential that now exists between civilian pay and military pay, so that the military pay would be provided in the same terms and conditions as civilian pay.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption of the motion to recommit.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] insist on his point of order?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit with instructions because it is not germane to the underlying resolution, and as such in violation of clause 7 of rule XVI.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Precedents of the House:

"It is not in order to do indirectly by a motion to commit with instructions what may not be done directly by way of amendment."

Mr. Speaker, a specific proposition cannot be amended by another proposition broader in scope. The motion to recommit deals with funding and authorizing activities outside the Department of Veterans Affairs, and therefore is not germane to the underlying resolution which deals only with funding for selected activities in this department.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's motion to instruct is not germane, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say the purpose of the resolution before us this evening is to provide additional services to taxpayers. The purpose of my motion is to provide additional services to taxpayers. It simply expands the number of services available. It is the same taxpayers we are talking about, and I think they are entitled to a full range of services. I would therefore urge the Chair support the germaneness of the proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The pending joint resolution continues the availability of appropriations for a specified fiscal period to fund certain activities of the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

The amendment proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin seeks to continue the availability of appropriations for a similar fiscal period to fund the activities of other departments and agencies for which regular appropriations for fiscal year 1996 have not yet been enacted.

One of the important lines of precedent under clause 7 of rule 16—the germaneness rule—holds that a proposition addressing a specific subject may not be amended by a proposition more general in nature.

For example, the Chair held on September 27, 1967, that an amendment applicable to all departments and agencies was not germane to a bill limited in its applicability to certain departments and agencies of Government. That precedent is annotated in section 798f of the House Rules and Manual.

The Chair notes another illustrative ruling that is recorded in the Deschler-Brown precedents of the House at volume 10, chapter 28, section 9.22. On that occasion in 1967 the House was considering a joint resolution continuing appropriations for a portion of a fiscal year. An amendment was offered to restrict total administrative expenditures for the fiscal year. Noting that the amendment affected funding beyond that continued by the joint resolution, the Chair sustained a point of order that the amendment was not germane.

The amendment proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin addresses funding not continued by the pending joint resolution. Where the joint resolution confines itself to funding within one department, the amendment ranges to at least six others. As such, the amendment is not germane.

The point of order is sustained. The motion to recommit is ruled out of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I most respectfully and reluctantly appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: "shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] to lay the appeal of the ruling of the Chair on the table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 176, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 872]

AYES—236

Allard
Archer

Armey
Bachus

Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)

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

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

Gordon
 Green
 Hall (TX)
 Hamilton
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hefner
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Holden
 Hoyer
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy (MA)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kennelly
 Kildee
 Kleczka
 Klink
 LaFalce
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lincoln
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Luther
 Maloney
 Manton
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui

McCarthy
 McDermott
 McHale
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek
 Menendez
 Mfume
 Miller (CA)
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Molohan
 Moran
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Neal
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Orton
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pastor
 Payne (NJ)
 Pelosi
 Peterson (FL)
 Peterson (MN)
 Pickett
 Pomeroy
 Poshard
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Richardson
 Rivers
 Roemer

Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanders
 Sawyer
 Schroeder
 Schumer
 Scott
 Serrano
 Siskisky
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Spratt
 Stenholm
 Stokes
 Studds
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Tejada
 Thompson
 Thornton
 Thurman
 Torres
 Torricelli
 Towns
 Traficant
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Volkmer
 Ward
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Wise
 Woolsey
 Wyden
 Wynn

eligibility requirements for such benefits; and

(2) payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs are made when due in the case of services provided that directly relate to patient health and safety.

(b) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payments pursuant to subsection (a), including such amounts as may be necessary for the costs of administration of such payments.

(c) CHARGING OF ACCOUNTS WHEN APPROPRIATIONS MADE.—In any case in which the Secretary uses the authority of subsection (a) to make payments, applicable accounts shall be charged for amounts so paid, and for the costs of administration of such payments, when regular appropriations become available for those purposes.

(d) EXISTING BENEFITS SPECIFIED.—For purposes of this section, existing veterans benefits are benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that have been adjudicated and authorized for payment as of—

(1) December 15, 1995; or

(2) if appropriations for such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)) after December 15, 1995, the last day on which appropriations for payment of such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)).

SECTION 201. PAY FOR FEDERAL AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES DURING LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) PROVISIONS RELATING TO THOSE WHO ARE PERMITTED OR REQUIRED TO SERVE.—Any officer or employee of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia government who is permitted or required to serve during any period in which there is a lapse in appropriations with respect to the agency in or under which such officer or employee is employed shall be compensated at the standard rate of compensation for such officer or employee for such period.

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN FURLOUGHED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any officer or employee of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia government who is furloughed for any period as a result of a lapse in appropriations shall not be entitled to basic pay with respect to any portion of such period, except as provided in paragraph (2)

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee referred to in paragraph (1) who is willing and able to serve during the period of the lapse in appropriations—

(A) shall be permitted to serve; and

(B) shall be compensated for any such service in accordance with subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term “agency” includes any employing entity of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia government.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply with respect to any lapse in appropriations for fiscal year 1996 occurring after December 15, 1995.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order but reserve that point of order if the gentleman will make a brief explanation.

NOT VOTING—21

Beilenson
 Berman
 Chapman
 Conyers
 Edwards
 Filner
 Flake
 Foglietta
 Gilchrest
 Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Lantos
 Myers
 Payne (VA)
 Rose
 Skaggs
 Stark
 Weldon (PA)
 Williams
 Wilson
 Yates

□ 2217

Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the minority leader, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. In its present form, yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

Sec. 101. ENSURED PAYMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1996 OF VETERANS' BENEFITS IN EVENT OF LACK OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—In any case during fiscal year 1996 in which appropriations are not otherwise available for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall nevertheless ensure that—

(1) payments of existing veterans benefits are made in accordance with regular procedures and schedules and in accordance with

NOES—176

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baesler
 Baldacci
 Barcia
 Barrett (WI)
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Bevil
 Bishop
 Bonior
 Borski
 Boucher
 Brewster
 Browder
 Brown (CA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Bryant (TX)
 Cardin
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Coleman
 Collins (IL)
 Collins (MI)
 Condit
 Costello
 Coyne
 Cramer
 Danner
 de la Garza
 DeFazio
 DeLauro
 Dellums
 Deutsch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Dixon
 Doggett
 Dooley
 Doyle
 Durbin
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Evans
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fazio
 Fields (LA)
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Frost
 Furse
 Gejdenson
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gonzalez

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 5 minutes. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes I will only take 1.

Mr. Speaker, as it now stands, government workers cannot volunteer to come in to work during the shutdown, but the Speaker has announced tonight that they will nonetheless be paid. What this motion would simply do, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], is that we simply say that since workers will be paid, the ought to be allowed to come in and work if they want to. That is in essence all this does.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply, in asking for a ruling from the Chair, indicate that I think on both sides of the aisle we recognize that you have tried to do an extremely fair job tonight, and we congratulate you for it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I echo the gentleman's remarks about the way the Speaker has maintained order throughout this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit with instructions because it is not germane to the underlying resolution, and as such is in violation of clause 7, of Rule XVI.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Precedents of the House:

It is not in order to do indirectly by a motion to commit with instructions what may not be done directly by way of amendment.

Mr. Speaker, a specific proposition can not be amended by another proposition broader in scope. The motion to recommit deals with funding and authorizing activities outside the Department of Veterans Affairs, and therefore is not germane to the underlying resolution which deals only with funding for selected activities in this department.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's motion to instruct is not germane, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the purpose of this resolution tonight is to open certain functions of the veterans Department so that the public can receive the benefit of the services from that department.

We are simply saying that since it has already been announced that government workers will be paid afterwards, whether they work or not, that we think they ought to be allowed to work, and I will leave the ruling in the hands of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Using the same reasoning as in the case of the previous point of order, the Chair finds that the amendment proposed in this second motion to recommit exceeds the relatively narrow ambit of the joint resolution by addressing the compensation of Federal employees on government-wide bases. Accordingly,

the point of order is sustained, and the motion to recommit is ruled out of order.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the minority leader, I offer a third motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman remains opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

SEC. 101. ENSURED PAYMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1996 OF VETERANS' BENEFITS IN EVENT OF LACK OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—In any case during fiscal year 1996 in which appropriations are not otherwise available for programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall nevertheless ensure that—

(1) payments of existing veterans benefits are made in accordance with regular procedures and schedules and in accordance with eligibility requirements for such benefits; and

(2) payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs are made when due in the case of services provided that directly relate to patient health and safety.

“(3) all other authorized activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs including processing of existing and new applications for benefits and pensions, processing of certificates of eligibility for homeownership loans and loan guarantees, and payment of salaries of federal government personnel providing health care for our nation's veterans, are continued at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate in existence on December 15, 1995.

(b) FUNDING.—There is hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payments pursuant to subsection (a), including such amounts as may be necessary for the costs of administration of such payments.

(c) CHARGING OF ACCOUNTS WHEN APPROPRIATIONS MADE.—In any case in which the Secretary uses the authority of subsection (a) to make payments, applicable accounts shall be charged for amounts so paid, and for the costs of administration of such payments, when regular appropriations become available for those purposes.

(d) EXISTING BENEFITS SPECIFIED.—For purposes of this section, existing veterans benefits are benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that have been adjudicated and authorized for payment as of—

(1) December 15, 1995; or

(2) if appropriations for such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)) after December 15, 1995, the last day on which appropriations for payment for such benefits are available (other than pursuant to subsection (b)).

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is very simple. The proposition now before the House allows the Veterans Department to open for the purpose of payments of existing veterans' benefits and to provide payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs when due in the case of services, provided that those services directly relate to patient health and safety.

All we would do is add the following language. We would add language saying that the Veterans Department would also be open for all other authorized activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including the processing of existing and new applications for benefits and pensions, processing of certificates of eligibility for home ownership loans and loan guarantees, and payment of salaries of Federal Government personnel providing health care for our Nation's veterans.

And that they would be continued at a rate for operations not to exceed the rate in existence on December 15, 1995.

That is all it does. It simply says if you are going to open up the Veterans Department, open it up to everyone.

I would urge the Members of the majority, in the interest of comity, in the interest of rationality, to accept this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to oppose this motion, and I ask that it be defeated. We have made a good-faith effort to address the specific veterans' problems that were included in this bill, so that they can get their checks next week. We should pass this bill.

We want to work with all parties, the White House, the minority, and various members of our committee to take care of the balance of the other concerns down the line. But let us defeat this motion, let us pass the bill, let us conclude our business and let us go home for the night.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 234, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 873]

AYES—178

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

NOES—234

Allard	Castle	Ewing
Archer	Chabot	Fawell
Armey	Chambliss	Fields (TX)
Bachus	Chenoweth	Flanagan
Baker (CA)	Christensen	Foley
Baker (LA)	Chrysler	Forbes
Ballenger	Clinger	Fowler
Barr	Coble	Fox
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Franks (CT)
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Barton	Combust	Frelinghuysen
Bass	Cooley	Frisa
Bateman	Cox	Funderburk
Bereuter	Crane	Gallely
Bilbray	Crapo	Ganske
Bilirakis	Creameans	Gekas
Bliley	Cubin	Geren
Blute	Cunningham	Gillmor
Boehlert	Davis	Gilman
Boehner	Deal	Goodlatte
Bonilla	DeLay	Goodling
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Brownback	Dickey	Graham
Bryant (TN)	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bunn	Dornan	Gunderson
Bunning	Dreier	Gutknecht
Burr	Duncan	Hall (TX)
Burton	Dunn	Hancock
Buyer	Ehlers	Hansen
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hastert
Calvert	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Camp	English	Hayes
Campbell	Ensign	Hayworth
Canady	Everett	Hefley

Heineman	McDade	Schaefer
Herger	McHugh	Schiff
Hilleary	McInnis	Seastrand
Hobson	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McKeon	Shadegg
Hoke	Metcalf	Shaw
Horn	Meyers	Shays
Hostettler	Mica	Shuster
Houghton	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Hunter	Molinari	Smith (MI)
Hutchinson	Montgomery	Smith (NJ)
Hyde	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Inglis	Morella	Smith (WA)
Istook	Myrick	Solomon
Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Neumann	Spence
Jones	Ney	Stearns
Kasich	Norwood	Stockman
Kelly	Nussle	Stump
Kim	Oxley	Talent
King	Packard	Tate
Kingston	Parker	Tauzin
Klug	Paxon	Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg	Petri	Thomas
Kolbe	Pombo	Thornberry
LaHood	Porter	Tiahrt
Largent	Portman	Torkildsen
Latham	Pryce	Upton
LaTourette	Quillen	Vucanovich
Laughlin	Quinn	Waldholtz
Lazio	Radanovich	Walker
Leach	Ramstad	Walsh
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Watts (OK)
Lightfoot	Roberts	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Rogers	Weller
Livingston	Rohrabacher	White
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Longley	Roth	Wicker
Lucas	Royce	Wolf
Manzullo	Salmon	Young (AK)
Martini	Sanford	Young (FL)
McCollum	Saxton	Zeliff
McCrery	Scarborough	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Beilenson	Gilchrest	Rose
Chapman	Gutierrez	Skaggs
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Stark
Edwards	Lantos	Weldon (PA)
Filner	Myers	Williams
Flake	Oliver	Wilson
Foglietta	Payne (VA)	Yates

□ 2242

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 874]

YEAS—411

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

Christensen	Hansen	Menendez
Chrysler	Harman	Metcalf
Clay	Hastert	Meyers
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Clinger	Hayes	Miller (CA)
Clyburn	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hefley	Minge
Coburn	Hefner	Mink
Coleman	Heineman	Moakley
Collins (GA)	Herger	Molinari
Collins (IL)	Hilleary	Mollohan
Collins (MI)	Hilliard	Montgomery
Combust	Hinchey	Moorhead
Condit	Hobson	Moran
Cooley	Hoekstra	Morella
Costello	Hoke	Murtha
Cox	Holden	Myrick
Coyne	Horn	Nadler
Cramer	Hostettler	Neal
Crane	Houghton	Nethercutt
Crapo	Hoyer	Neumann
Creameans	Hunter	Ney
Cubin	Hutchinson	Norwood
Cunningham	Nussle	Oberstar
Danner	Hyde	Oliver
Davis	Inglis	Ortiz
de la Garza	Istook	Orton
Deal	Jackson (IL)	Owens
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Oxley
DeLauro	(TX)	Packard
DeLay	Jacobs	Pallone
Dellums	Jefferson	Parker
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Paxon
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Dingell	Johnston	Peterson (FL)
Dixon	Jones	Peterson (MN)
Doggett	Kanjorski	Petri
Dooley	Kaptur	Pickett
Doolittle	Kasich	Pombo
Dornan	Kelly	Pomeroy
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Duncan	Kennelly	Poshard
Dunn	Kildee	Pryce
Durbin	Kim	Quillen
Ehlers	King	Quinn
Ehrlich	Kingston	Radanovich
Emerson	Klecza	Rahall
Engel	Klink	Ramstad
English	Klug	Rangel
Ensign	Knollenberg	Reed
Eshoo	Kolbe	Regula
Evans	LaFalce	Richardson
Everett	LaHood	Riggs
Ewing	Largent	Rivers
Farr	Latham	Roberts
Fattah	LaTourette	Roemer
Fawell	Laughlin	Rogers
Fazio	Lazio	Rohrabacher
Fields (LA)	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
Fields (TX)	Levin	Roth
Flanagan	Lewis (CA)	Roukema
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Ford	Lightfoot	Rush
Fowler	Lincoln	Sabo
Fox	Linder	Salmon
Frank (MA)	Lipinski	Sanders
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Sanford
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Sawyer
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Saxton
Frisa	Longley	Scarborough
Frost	Lowey	Schaefer
Funderburk	Lucas	Schiff
Furse	Luther	Schroeder
Gallely	Maloney	Schumer
Ganske	Manton	Scott
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Seastrand
Gekas	Markey	Sensenbrenner
Gephardt	Martinez	Serrano
Geren	Martini	Shadegg
Gillmor	Mascara	Shaw
Gilman	Matsui	Shays
Gonzalez	McCarthy	Shuster
Goodlatte	McCollum	Sisisky
Goodling	McCrery	Skeen
Gordon	McDade	Skelton
Goss	McDermott	Slaughter
Graham	Goss	Smith (MI)
Green	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Greenwood	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Gunderson	McIntosh	Smith (WA)
Gutknecht	McKeon	Solomon
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Souder
Hamilton	McNulty	Spence
Hancock	Meehan	
	Meek	

Spratt	Thurman	Watt (NC)
Stearns	Tiahrt	Watts (OK)
Stenholm	Torkildsen	Waxman
Stockman	Torres	Weldon (FL)
Stokes	Torricelli	Weller
Studds	Towns	White
Stump	Trafigant	Whitfield
Stupak	Upton	Wicker
Talent	Velazquez	Wise
Tanner	Vento	Wolf
Tate	Visclosky	Woolsey
Tauzin	Volkmer	Wyden
Taylor (MS)	Vucanovich	Wynn
Taylor (NC)	Waldholtz	Young (AK)
Tejeda	Walker	Young (FL)
Thomas	Walsh	Zeliff
Thompson	Wamp	Zimmer
Thornberry	Ward	
Thornton	Waters	

NAYS—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—21

Beilenson	Gibbons	Rose
Chapman	Gilcrest	Skaggs
Conyers	Gutierrez	Stark
Edwards	Hall (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Filner	Lantos	Williams
Flake	Myers	Wilson
Foglietta	Payne (VA)	Yates

□ 2258

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE OPEN FOR ALL CITIZENS

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply take this time to explain for the RECORD why I have cast the only vote against the proposition the House just voted on. I did not vote no because I was opposed to the proposition; as I said during debate, no one was opposed to the proposition. But House rules dictate if I were to be in a position to offer a motion to recommit that I needed to vote "no" on final passage.

I did so because I felt strongly that we should not only open the government for the services provided in the resolution, but should also open the Government for the purpose of other services that could be provided by the veterans department, and all other government employees as well.

The motion that I offered included all of the language of the original resolution, plus the additional language that would have opened up other functions of the veterans department, providing those services as well, and opened up all other agencies of the government which remained closed.

So for procedural reasons, to protect my right to offer that language which included all of the language provided in the original resolution, I was required by the House rules to vote "no."

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET BY FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is the gentleman from Mississippi making a notice?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I have a privileged resolution at the desk. As you know, the Chair can either bring this up immediately—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no privileged resolution at the desk.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has is, has his privileged motion been properly noticed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that the gentleman is trying to properly notice his resolution as privileged.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am informing the Chair of my intention to serve a privileged resolution before this body, and as the Chair knows, under the Rules of the House, the Chair may bring this up immediately or may ask for a 2-legislative-day delay on this matter.

Since the matter involves the highest privilege of the Members collectively, and that is the privilege of doing our constitutionally mandated responsibility of providing for the budget in the appropriations of this country, I would ask for its immediate consideration.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have no budget before this country, and 300,000 good people are wondering whether or not they are going to get paid.

We have a job to do. We are 81 days late in fulfilling our legal responsibility of providing for a budget for this country. The budget that was passed has been vetoed by the President. There are not sufficient votes to get the two-thirds majority to override the President, and it is my intention to submit, as a result of that, privileged resolution H.R. 2530, commonly referred to as the coalition budget, in an effort to break this impasse.

I would like to point out that under rule IV of the Rules of the House of Representatives, Questions of Privilege, clause 1 states questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively. Article I, section 9, clause 7 reads, and I am quoting, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of an appropriation made by law."

Obviously, we cannot solve this budget impasse until we have passed and

the President has approved a budget. Today marks the 81st day that this Congress has been delinquent in fulfilling our statutory responsibility of enacting a budget into law; and again, one has passed, but short of the two-thirds majority needed to override the presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, by failing to enact a budget into law, this body has failed to fulfill our most basic constitutionally mandated duties. This Congress has failed to appropriate the necessary funds to fulfill the vital functions of our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi suspend?

The Chair would advise the gentleman, the gentleman needs to make notice to the House of his resolution. The Chair would ask the gentleman to state his notice.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am doing so in telling my fellow Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Could the gentleman from Mississippi read the title of his resolution in order to give notice to the House?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Sir, as of today, I am introducing the coalition budget, H.R. 2530, to provide for deficit reduction and achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002, as a privileged resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days of its being properly noticed. That designation will be announced at a later time.

In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Mississippi will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not at this point making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at a time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Will the Speaker recognize me for a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the title will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. The Chair has fulfilled my request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] has filed a motion, and I understand that the Chair has ruled that this will be dealt with by the Speaker in the next 2 days.