

cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been authorized by the minority party leadership on this side of the aisle to make such a request. When will someone be authorized on the majority side to make such a request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry at this point.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the previous vote, I ask unanimous consent to bring up House Joint Resolution 155, a clean continuing resolution that funds this Government as amended through January 26, supported by over 45 Members of this House, which will allow workers in the Federal Government to perform at their fullest services and to ensure that the Government is operating during the budget negotiations.

Mr. DREIER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers and recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentlewoman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The inquiry is, as my colleagues stated, when would we be able to hear from the other side?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 134, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-448) on the resolution (H. Res. 336) providing for the disposition of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 134) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES FROM JANUARY 5, 1996, THROUGH JANUARY 23, 1996, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That (a) the Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 5, 1996, through Tuesday, January 9, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 9, 1996.

(b) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Tuesday, January 9, 1996, through Friday, January 12, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Friday, January 12, 1996.

(c) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 12, 1996, through Tuesday, January 16, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 16, 1996.

(d) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Tuesday, January 16, 1996, through Friday, January 19, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Friday, January 19, 1996.

(e) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 19, 1996, through Tuesday, January 23, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 23, 1996.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee before the calendar day of Wednesday, January 24, 1996, and providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A bill making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(3) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(4) A bill to provide for a balanced budget by 2002, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The gentlewoman from

Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Ms. PRYCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 330 is a two-part resolution. First, it allows the Speaker of the House to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday January 5, 1996, through Tuesday, January 9, 1996, and for 3-day periods thereafter until Tuesday, January 23, 1996.

Second, this resolution waives clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same-day it is reported from the Rules Committee, against certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules before calendar day Wednesday, January 24, 1996.

This resolution covers special rules that provide for the consideration or disposition of specific budget legislation, including fiscal year 1996 appropriations, continuing resolutions, public debt limit increases or waivers, and a 7-year balanced budget bill. The resolution also covers amendments, conference reports, or amendments reported in disagreement from a conference on such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is primarily focused on moving toward a speedy solution to the budget dilemma that confronts this body, by facilitating the same-day consideration of urgent budget legislation that will reopen the entire Federal Government or provide a new 7-year balanced budget plan. When Congress and the administration come to agreement on these issues, the House will be able to act immediately to end the budget crisis.

However, in the absence of legislative activity that moves us toward these goals, this resolution provides the Speaker the ability to declare recesses while the budget negotiations between our leadership and the White House continue.

By recessing rather than adjourning, the House will effectively be on standby, ready to return should the White House come to meet its responsibility and submit legislation, as promised, that achieves a balanced budget and puts the Government back into full operation.

Further, should the President do his duty and the House does return ready for action, these urgent budget measures can be considered under an expedited process.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution, the House is not abdicating its responsibilities. In fact, the House has

worked very hard, with a great deal of success, to fulfill its duties. As a result, about 75 percent of the Government is on the job, serving the taxpayers.

Three other appropriations bills, which would have put a large number of the remaining Federal employees back to work, were passed by Congress, but vetoed by the President. Had the President signed these bills, 95 percent Federal employees would have been working and receiving their paycheck.

Two other appropriations bills are pending action in the other body, and the last spending bill is still in conference.

Under this resolution, as soon as these appropriations bills are ready for consideration, the House may give them immediate attention under an expedited process.

And, the House just voted to fund some of the most important Government functions, so that meals for seniors, child welfare programs, unemployment benefits, AFDC, passports, and veterans programs would not be denied. Further, we just voted to ensure that Federal employees are no longer held hostage by the President's inaction and receive their pay.

The resolution now before us will allow the House to take the next step and reopen the entire Federal Government once the President produces his balanced budget, under a process that allows immediate action.

Mr. Speaker, responsibility can also be demonstrated by keeping one's promises. The Republican Majority has worked diligently over the past year to keep its promise to the American people by crafting and passing a Balanced Budget Act which eliminates the deficit in 7 years. However, these efforts may mean little if a balanced budget is not enacted into law.

The President has made a similar promise, numerous times, and most recently in writing, he signed into law a promise to Congress and the American people that he will enact a budget that reaches balance by the year 2002, using the Congressional Budget Office's numbers.

Currently, Congress, Federal workers, and the American people are waiting for the President to keep his word and fulfill his end of the bargain. Frankly, his failure to do so is unacceptable.

When the President finally gives us his budget from which to begin to negotiate, the terms of this resolution would permit the House to come back into session to respond quickly and appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, the budget impasse facing this House and the Nation is serious, and clearly, the shutdown of the Government is undesirable, but the future of our country is at stake. My colleagues who are committed to a balanced budget are not trying to ignore the situation at hand. Instead, those of us who are truly committed to a balanced budget are taking bold steps to

confront the real financial crisis that faces our Nation, because it is responsible and it is right and we are so close and this is our last best chance.

This resolution will allow us to continue to work toward the goal of fiscal responsibility in a practical manner. House Resolution 330 is appropriate in light of these unique circumstances. It is a tool we need to keep the budget negotiations on line. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today is completely irresponsible.

The United States Government has been closed for 21 days. Of 2 million civilian Federal employees, 280,000 have been sent home and 480,000 are working but not getting paid. A total of 38 percent of the Federal work force is not getting a paycheck.

Thanks to the targeted appropriations bill we did earlier, those people will be able to go back to work and even get their paychecks, but, many of them will not be able to actually do their work because the Republican leadership won't let them.

Many Federal programs are still not funded and thousands of Americans are still not getting the services they expect and the services they earned.

Medicare contractors which employ 24,000 people will not get paid, States will run out of Medicaid matching funds to pay for poor children's health care, small businesses won't get loans; workplace safety and health complaints will not be inspected, and EPA is still unfunded which means superfund sites are not cleaned and environmental hazards are not investigated.

And what's the response of the people who closed the Government in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is responding by going home.

For those who wonder why on earth anyone would do this, it's because Republicans want the President to do something he won't do. They want President Clinton to agree to their idea of cutting Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the rich. Until he does they are going to hold the entire country hostage.

Mr. Speaker, this 21-day shutdown tantrum is the most arrogant abuse of power I have seen in a very long time and I do not understand it.

I do not understand how Speaker GINGRICH can send his Republicans home while so many people are suffering. And make no mistake about it, the responsibility for this shutdown lies squarely in the lap of Speaker GINGRICH.

Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is serious and it is hurting a lot of people this month, 49,000 families may be evicted

from their homes because their housing vouchers are not getting renewed.

Mr. Speaker, these people did nothing wrong. They expected Government services, they earned Government services, and under no circumstances should they have to pay the price for this political blackmail.

And to make matters worse, a majority of House Members want to open the Government, but the Republican leadership won't let us.

Some say this fight is about philosophy. They say that Republicans have closed the Government because they have philosophical differences with the President.

I guess I do not know very much about philosophy because I can not look some of these people in the eye and tell them there is a good reason for their frustration.

The people who think this philosophical difference is worth the pain it is causing are in the minority. Wednesday, a Republican Member said, "GOP leaders know they would lose a vote on the floor."

Mr. Speaker, this 21-day shutdown is cruel and unnecessary. It would end if it were brought to a vote. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, Speaker GINGRICH should keep Congress in town until the Government is completely open again.

With respect to the two-thirds waiver, I would say to my colleagues that they have managed to bring up a rule meant for last minute, emergency bills on just the second day of the session, at least we waited until the end.

□ 1500

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

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just turned in my prepared remarks. I was going to make an appeal to try to shorten the debate on not only this very important resolution but the one that is going to come up right after that. We have been working very closely with the other side of the aisle, we have been working very closely with the other body, with the leader of the Democratic Party in the other body, and we have had a lot of cooperation.

Then I hear my good friend, JOE MOAKLEY, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, stand up here and go through a charade that we went through several weeks ago at Christmastime.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I will be glad to yield to my good friend from North Carolina, a good Congressman.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be curious to know if the gentleman

listened to the political statement that his party made prior to yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was a political statement made over here, so let us—

Mr. SOLOMON. I have been listening very, very carefully, and what I am doing now is just trying to get us all to come to reason here, because this rule that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has just asked you to vote against is an expedited procedure rule.

What it does, it allows us anytime in the next 21 days, before the President's State of the Union Message, before we actually take up other legislation, it allows us to act in an expeditious manner on issues of terrible importance. It allows us to take up any amendments in disagreement that might come about from the other body through conference reports. It allows us to take up any of the vetoed bills for the Department of Veterans' Affairs and housing, the Environmental Protection Agency; it allows us to take up the Commerce-Justice-State bill; it allows us to take up the Interior bill that the President vetoed that is keeping the parks closed.

That is really what this is all about. But more important than that, it allows Members to take up this afternoon, before going home for the weekend, a continuing resolution that members of the minority have been asking for. It is a clean resolution for another 21 days.

What does that mean? That means that those of us who are going to stay around here for the next 21 days are going to be negotiating with the President, trying to bring about a compromise that will bring us a balanced budget in 7 years. That is really what this is all about.

So to stand here and say well, let us defeat this rule and let us be around here next week, you know, many of us are going to be around here all next week, but it is time now for us to pass this. We have assurances from the other body that they are going to accept by unanimous consent the bill we just debated that puts all of the Federal workers back to work, that pays them for their past wages, that is going to pay them for their future wages if they continue to work. That is what that bill did.

The next bill that will come up, if we pass this rule, is going to allow for a clean continuing resolution. That is what the President wanted.

If he does that, and if he gives us his budget that balances the budget in 7 years, we are going to see what his cuts in Medicare are, and if he is cutting \$100 billion and we are cutting the increase by \$180 billion, then we have got something to work between, between \$100 and \$180 billion. If he is calling for tax cuts and we are calling for tax cuts, let us see what the differences in the dollar amounts are.

That is what this resolution does. It is an expedited procedure. Every one of

you should vote for it. We ought to cut out this political dart-throwing, and let us get down and get the Government back working, and let us get the balanced budget. That is what the American people want.

What do you think of that? Let us do it.

Mr. Speaker and Members, the resolution before the House will provide us with the scheduling flexibility necessary to complete the ongoing budget negotiations in a timely and orderly fashion.

It is important to note, as the gentle lady from Ohio explained, that this resolution not only authorizes additional recess authority to the Speaker but it provides expedited procedures for the consideration of a bill to balance the budget by 2002 or a bill including further continuing appropriations.

This resolution is in fact a resolution to allow us to continue our work in an expeditious manner.

As we are in the midst of only a partial government shutdown, let me take a moment to recap the status of the appropriations process. There is no need to assign blame for this partial shutdown. The facts will speak for themselves.

To date, seven appropriations bills have been enacted into law. One conference report is pending in the Senate and one bill is still in conference.

The bill that funds the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services has passed the House but is facing a filibuster in the other body by the Democrat minority.

Three other bills, funding a huge percentage of the Federal Government, were vetoed by the President one week before Christmas. The President had an opportunity to open the bulk of the Cabinet departments and agencies now closed by signing those bills.

Three days after this partial shutdown began, President Clinton vetoed the Veterans and HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill, citing excessive cuts to the EPA.

Most accounts in that bill were cut to pay for an increase in the Veterans' hospital account. We have told the White House, in a good faith negotiation, to take money from any other parts of the bill except veterans, if the President insists on increasing funds for EPA, but he has refused to do so.

If the President had signed this bill, all of the workers in VA hospitals, Department of Housing, EPA, and a host of other agencies would be back on the job and earning their salary.

Also on December 18, the President had another opportunity to open many government offices for work. Instead, he chose to veto the Interior appropriations bill on the grounds that the cuts were too severe.

We told the White House, in another honest negotiation, to shift the money around to reflect their priorities without increasing the total dollars, but they refused to do it.

If the President signed this legislation, this bill, would have allowed countless Americans to enjoy our parks and museums.

On December 19, four days into the partial Government shutdown, the President closed four Cabinet departments and several agencies by vetoing the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill.

How could the President close the Justice and State departments, many Americans are wondering?

As with other bills he vetoed, the President objected to cuts in the bill designed to balance the budget overall. We told the White House that add-backs would be acceptable, if—and only if—the President specified where the cuts should come from, elsewhere in the bill.

Again, he refused. If the President had signed this bill, these Federal workers would be on the job earning their pay and the needless hassles in getting a passport would not exist.

We sent the President a clean CR, on November 20, with a simple paragraph attached committing the President and the Congress to enacting a bill that would balance the budget by 2002 scored by the CBO.

To this day, the White House has not presented such a document to the Congress.

Over the last few days, I have noticed the Democrat rhetoric obscuring the precise nature of the President's commitment in November.

Let me call Members' attention to House Joint Resolution 122, which passed the House on November 20, 1995 by an overwhelming vote of 421 to 4.

This legislation contained a temporary spending measure to keep the Government open and committed the President and the Congress to a 7-year balanced budget scored by the CBO.

The President signed this measure into law on November 20, 1995. So there is no confusion—this is Public Law 104-56.

Mr. Speaker, we are a society of laws, and our adherence to the rule of law has set our Nation apart in history. I urge the President to comply with the law he helped enact.

Over the last several days, we heard from some of our Democrat colleagues that we ought to resolve this partial Government shutdown immediately and deal with our philosophical differences over entitlement spending later.

The unspoken implication in this Democrat argument is—balancing the budget in 7 years is not all that important. We can deal with that pesky deficit sometime later. Balancing the budget is a goal that can wait for an undefined, later date.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of logic that has created the fiscal mess we are in today. This crisis cannot wait any longer.

The fact that public officials behaved irresponsibly in the past is not a compelling reason why we should do so today.

Mr. Speaker, since we have already passed a targeted appropriations bill funding selective programs to demonstrate our good faith, we are prepared to pass a continuing resolution conditioned on the President delivering a 7-year balanced budget scored by the CBO and delivered to this Congress. He can do this in a matter of hours or just minutes if he accepts the proposal.

I urge support for this resolution, so that we can continue this process of balancing the budget in 7 years.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution might as well be entitled the congressional R&R resolution of 1996. That is what it really is.

The sad thing about this process is that an immense amount of energy on

both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Capitol, have been invested in trying to restart the Government every 2 or 3 weeks rather than in trying to find real solutions to real problems that affect real people in each of our own districts back home. And now we are asked to do it again.

What this resolution really says is that the Congress will be allowed to get out of town, until the 25th, and the Government will be reopened partially during that time period. Then the day after Congress gets back to town, the Government shuts down again, at least those portions that have been opened up by the resolution that just passed.

That is clearly not a process designed to relieve the problems faced by taxpayers, or to relieve the problems faced by consumers of Government services. That is simply a process designed to relieve the pressure on Members of Congress to stay here and do their duty and seek resolution of these major issues. That is the problem.

I would respectfully suggest to the House that we ought to vote "no" on this resolution, and I believe that the congressional leadership and all of the rest of us ought to remain in town, working on these problems, until they are resolved, and the Government should be maintained in an open rather than closed status while we are going through that process.

All this is simply a device by which Members can either go to their districts or take a little vacation. Someone even said the Speaker is planning a fundraising trip. This simply lets him get out of town while the Government is temporarily opened for the convenience not of the public we are supposed to serve but of the Members of Congress. That is a lousy standard and I think we ought to turn this resolution down.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when I was managing the last rule that we brought up, I closed by referring to an editorial that was written by Charles Krauthammer. I went upstairs and I actually got a copy of that editorial.

Mr. Speaker, it was on New Year's Day, and Mr. Krauthammer wrote that:

The grossest misperception about the great budget deadlock is the widespread notion, fed by the media, that this is just business as usual. In fact, it is the opposite. If this were business as usual, the Republicans would have found a nice, cozy compromise using phony numbers and meaningless projections, claimed victory and gone home happy.

Not only is this not business as usual, we left business as usual behind months ago. We are well into uncharted territory in this budget confrontation.

In the past, when there were budget disagreements, it would take a week-end of keeping tourists out of the Washington Monument to convince Congress and the President that they should find a way to get the Government going again. Unfortunately, this business-as-usual get-it-done-tomorrow attitude has left this country crippled by a massive \$5 trillion Federal debt.

This debt is an anchor around our economy, stifling living standards, reducing our economic competitiveness, and making interest payments the second largest budget item for the Federal Government.

Congress is now run by a breed of elected officials that are committed, above all, to do what they said they would do when they ran for office. I must admit, this is a very new concept, especially in Washington. I can understand how many Americans could be confused by a Congress run by people who insist on meeting the commitments they made to the voters.

Americans, unfortunately, have come to expect politicians that promise a balanced budget when they run for office, and offer more debt once in office. They have seen Presidential candidates promise a middle-class tax cut while running for office, only to offer a tax increase once in office. It is understandable that people want to see Congress deliver on promises. They want "promises made, promises kept."

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, will do just that. Balancing the budget in 7 years is our promise. We will not settle for the business as usual of phony balanced budgets which have been offered by the President, he is 4-for-4, the most recent one has an \$87 billion deficit in the last, the 7th year, 2002. We will use every tool that we possibly can to achieve a balanced budget. We must do this for our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and move ahead so that we will, in fact, be able to bring about the kind of resolution that can keep the Government going and at the same time keep our eye on the ball, and, that is, balancing the Federal budget.

□ 1515

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would take issue with the gentleman from California who said that the people that are now running this House are doing what the American people were told. The American people were not told that we were going to have a balanced budget at the expense of our elderly, our most vulnerable people in the country. You did not tell the American people we were going to cut Medicare and Medicaid. You did not tell the American people you were going to cut all the agencies that supervise our

clean drinking water, the food we eat. That is not what you told the American people.

You talked about line-item veto, which you have yet to give the President of the United States, which you passed in this House.

You blame all the problems for this impasse on the President of the United States, and every Republican since I was here since Richard Nixon, and Richard Nixon was the last Republican to offer a balanced budget on the floor of the House of Representatives. So I take issue with the gentleman from California.

The group running this place now did not promise the American people that, "If you will elect us, we are going to cut your Medicare, we are going to cut the Medicaid, and we are going to give a big tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country." That is not what you promised the American people, and the American people know it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, and Members, I cannot believe what I am hearing. My mother would say to the Republicans this morning, "You have the nerves of the brass monkey."

How dare you come here at a time when we are in a crisis, when Federal workers have been furloughed for 21 days, when Americans are being denied services, they cannot get passports, when the parks are closed down, when small business contractors cannot get paid, when FHA loans cannot be expedited? How dare you come before the American public and say give NEWT GINGRICH the authority to recess us, to simply let us go home, to let us go about our business, to let us go on vacation, for some of you to be able to go on foreign trips, just stop the work of Congress because you find that it is in your best interests to let this crisis drag on?

Well, I ask my colleagues not to support this. We need a clean, clear continuing resolution, the vehicle by which we continue to fund Government while we are in the process of debating which way Government.

This is not about a little dispute. This is about fundamental change. This is about which way American Government. This is about whether or not there is going to be a safety net for the average American worker out there. This is about whether or not we are going to give substantial tax breaks to the rich. This is no child's play.

We cannot make mockery of this process by simply coming here and asking for an expedited procedure to recess. No, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], we will not support you. No, we will not take your argument that says let us just do this little thing, go on home and leave it to us. We are not going to "leave it to us." You have shown that you are not responsible. You have shown that you are willing to be led by the newest Republican Members in this House, who

know nothing, who have no experience, and who do not care what happens to Government.

It is absolutely unconscionable that you should come here and ask us to simply go on recess, to simply forget about those who are hurting out there, to simply not understand the fright and the pain that Americans are experiencing. No, we will not go home. No, we are not going to give you this vote. No, we are not going to join in any little conspiracy with you to do in the American people at a time when they need our support and our understanding more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to vote it down, not in a little way but in a big way, in a huge way. Let them know we are not playing this silly game.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe what I just heard, for a Member of Congress to stand up and say that the new Members of this body, these freshmen Members from the Democrat and Republican Parties, do not know anything.

These Members of Congress just came from outside the beltway. They are affected like the rest of us, with this inside-the-beltway jargon. They know more about what is going on back home than all of us put together.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, one of those freshmen, an outstanding Member from California, who has brought his experience in local government and in the private sector to this body, and what a difference it has made.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the freshmen who was proud to be sworn in this year, I do have to ask the gentlewoman from California to recognize that the experience that this Member brings to this House is 20 years of representing the public directly.

In 1976, when Jimmy Carter was elected, I was elected to represent the people of the city of Imperial Beach. I was elected to be mayor. I was elected to be a county supervisor of 2.6 million people. I have some experience.

But most importantly in this is every one of those 20 years, Mr. Speaker, I, as an elected official, and the body I served on did something that California, the State of the gentlewoman from California, demanded; we passed a balanced budget for our government agency every one of those 20 years. And so when a Member stands up here and says somehow because we have not been on this House floor for more than 12 months we are inexperienced, the experience that this Member brings is 20 years of balanced budgets.

I wish this House had 20 years of experience balancing the budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will finish my statement.

I have just talked to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], as I have done, I think, with every single freshman from both sides of the aisle over the last 10 or 11 months.

Let me tell you what they are talking about. Here is the most serious problem facing this Government today, and that most serious problem is these deficits that are literally drowning this Nation in a sea of red ink.

I want you to just draw a pie. The pie is the budget of this Government. It is \$1.5 trillion. Today the interest, just the debt service on paying the interest of the debt that is held mostly by foreign nations in this world of ours, now totals \$250 billion a year, and that is with interest rates as low as they are today and inflation as low as it is today.

Let me tell you something, if we continued along this same path, the path that President Clinton gave us when he was first elected when his 5-year projection would have added another trillion dollars to the \$5 trillion debt, do you know what the slice of the pie just to pay the interest on that debt would be today? It would not be \$250 billion, it would be approaching \$350 billion.

Let us go back about 15 years ago when, because of deficit spending and irresponsible Government spending in this Congress, inflation had just skyrocketed to 13 percent. Do you know what the interest would be then? Instead of \$250 or \$350 billion, it would be over \$500 billion. What is compassionate about that?

If you truly want to help people in this country, who truly need help, you cannot do it by continuing this sea of red ink, because every year that the interest, the debt service, gets larger, that means less money to truly take care of those people that cannot take care of themselves. That is what this whole debate is about here today, and that is why we have to balance the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Speaking as another freshman who has not talked with the good chairman of the Committee on Rules, let me say he does not speak for this freshman. My constituents told me when I was back in my district where I came from, the private sector, not from government like the other freshman who spoke, they told me we should stay here and work.

My children go on recess at school. We are paid to stay here and work. If it means working to balance the budget, then we ought to stay here.

Let us vote down this ridiculous bill. The freshmen know better on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, as another freshman who has not yet spoken

to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I would like to note that I served in county government. The gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] and I were both on boards of supervisors, and I balanced 14 budgets.

One of the things we would never have done in my former job in local government was to leave town until the job was done.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution must be defeated. It is a resolution that allows Congress to go into recess for 21 days with the Government partially shut down.

For the last 21 days the Federal Government has not been paying some Federal workers to work and not paying other Federal workers not to work, while all the time promising to pay both groups for working and not working.

The GOP has come up with a brilliant new idea: "We will pay Federal workers to come to work but do not actually let them work." That is what we are doing here today. We are paying workers not to work. That is what the so-called back-to-work resolution that the Republicans have put out here on the floor is. It is an oxymoron. It is a contradiction in terms, like jumbo shrimp or carnivorous vegetarian or moderate freshman Republican. There is no such thing.

Now, just what are these Federal workers supposed to do when they come back to their offices for the next 21 days? Play solitaire? Watch "Oprah" in the office?

Well, I can tell you some of the things they will not be doing: Contractors will not be funding the processing of Medicare claims for our seniors. Funds will not be provided to State Medicaid programs. EPA will not be able to investigate midnight dumpers. OSHA will not be able to investigate workplace safety problems.

You know, in "Alice in Wonderland," the Red Queen said, "When I use a word, it means whatever I want it to mean. What matters is who is master."

The GOP reopening the Government means keeping it partially closed.

There is a better alternative. We should pass a clean continuing resolution for the next 21 days, but, no, the Republicans say, "We will not do that unless Bill Clinton agrees to submit a plan using CBO numbers for the next 7 years to balance the budget." However, the Republicans signed that very same contract back in November, promising they would submit a plan that would protect Medicare, protect education, protect the environment, and give back their crown jewel, their 245 billion dollars' worth of tax giveaways to the rich. They have refused thus far to give back their crown jewel of tax breaks for the rich, and as a result they are in violation of the contract last November.

So, the hostage again continues to be the Federal Government, their employees, and those who benefit from the services, Medicare, Medicaid, and those that need protection, and the environment of our country.

Vote "no" on this recess. Let us stay here and work to keep our whole Government open.

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

Mr. Speaker, just so the record is protected, let me read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "*** and the crown jewel is not given back but it is protected with the President's approval, and that is to adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth." That was what the Republicans signed, and that is what the President signed as well. We are still waiting for the President. We have been waiting for 50 days now, and we would like to see where he wants to start these negotiations.

□ 1530

It is very hard to negotiate in a vacuum. If you do not know where one side of the process stands, you cannot get anywhere. So, Mr. Speaker, we would implore the other side of the aisle to lean on President Clinton to get that to us so that we can have a clean CR. That is exactly what this vehicle will provide for. They will have the clean CR that they so desperately want, that we would all like to see, if the President submits that budget with our crown jewel intact.

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

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

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that all of us, in trying to come together on seeking resolution to the situation in which we find ourselves, try to not rewrite history, try to recall what the agreement was back in November. My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARKEY], just made the point very clearly, I thought, that not only did the President agree to use CBO numbers and seek a 7-year balanced budget, but the Congress also agreed—do not look away, I would ask the majority party to try to remember this. We also agreed that what we would do is we would see to it that we protected those matters that the President had at the forefront in believing that it was his responsibility to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. We did all agree to that. The majority party agreed to that.

So I think it is rather odd that everybody would say it is all the President's fault. You know, I have been around here the whole time, too. I have not yet seen the Republican Congress produce a new budget that does those things. Where is it? Have you presented

that budget? Is it on the table? One that protects Medicare and Medicaid?

I heard the chairman of the Committee on Rules just a minute ago say, well, the President can put it on the table, and if he is going to spend \$180 billion and we are going to spend \$100 billion, we can compromise to \$140 billion.

Wait a minute. Hold the phone. That puts the budget \$40 billion out of kilter, does it not, if we are using the President's budget? Of course it does. Where are you going to get the \$40 billion? You have not said where yet, have you? It is because you have not done your job.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little tired of sitting around here in the minority watching the majority saying, oh, this is all a White House problem. You have not met your obligation yet, and you know you have not. You have not put a budget on the table that respects what you said you would do last November. You are going to protect Medicare, you are going to protect Medicaid, you are not going to cut education, you are going to see to it we are going to continue to have school lunches for children in America. You have not done that, and I know why you have not, because you cannot do it and be honest with the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow up on the "Alice in Wonderland" analogy that the gentleman from Massachusetts made before, because that is what I feel like I am hearing today. I have the utmost respect for the gentlewoman from Ohio, the gentleman from New York on the Committee on Rules, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but this suggestion that somehow this resolution here is here in order to bring up legislation rather than to just allow the Congress and the House to go home is just nonsense.

The majority and the Committee on Rules have the prerogative at any point to bring up legislation next week, to bring up appropriations bills, to bring up budget bills, authorization bills, of any kind they please. The only reason why this resolution is before us today is because they want to go home.

There is a lot of business that has to be done here. The last time a resolution like this came up we went home for about a 10-day holiday between Christmas and New Year's. They are not going to come back in 3 days and look at what is going on and then come back 3 days later. They are just going to go home for 3 weeks. They are going to give the impression to the public that somehow they can bring up legislation next week or 2 or 3 days from now. That is not what this is all about. Everyone knows that informally everyone has been told this a 3-week opportunity to go home.

Again, the Government is going to be shut down. The Federal workers are

going to go back to work, but they are not going to have any work to do in many cases. The other CR that is going to come up later that deals with the balanced budget and opens up the Government again if the President agrees to certain terms, every one knows if that is passed here it is going to die in the Senate or not be passed into law.

It is just a farce. That is what this is all about. We have major disagreements here on Medicaid, on Medicare, on the environment. The Democrats want to preserve those programs. We need to sit down over the next few weeks with the Republicans and work out the differences so we can preserve Medicare, preserve Medicaid, preserve environment and educational programs that are important to Americans. This is not the time to go home.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why all the Members of this body would like to go on recess. It has been along, frustrating year. Virtually nothing has been accomplished, with all the rhetoric and all, lots of attention. But we ought not go home until we do our job.

The fact is that while Federal employees are no longer held hostage, they are still going to be held under house arrest. They will be paid, they will have their own personal needs taken care of, but they are locked in their offices. They cannot perform their work, because the money necessary to perform the work of the Federal Government is not provided for in this legislation.

So we have not done our job. That was our job, to provide the money, in addition to authorizing the programs, and we have not done our job. Until we do, we have no business going home.

The last time that the Republican majority overrode the will of the Democratic minority and vetoed to go home for the holidays, we created a situation where we will now, as a result of the last bill that was just passed, pay \$1.75 billion to Federal employees for not performing any work. They did not want that. They wanted to be doing their job. But \$1.75 billion will be paid out to civil servants who are miserable, who are frustrated, who want to serve the public, who chose a career in civil service, and now we think we can buy them off, essentially bribe them apparently to keep quiet. We will give you pay, but just go sit in your office. We do not want you performing your job.

We ought not do that. We have no business going home until we have done our job. Vote against the resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why my Republican colleagues are embarrassed to speak on a resolution of this character, because what it is going to do is it is going to

pay billions of dollars to people who ain't going to be able to do nothing to serve the public interest or carry out the functions of the Government.

The issue here is very simple: This is a go-home-or-go-traveling resolution. People who on this side are going to vote for this are going to be able to go home and tell the people what a great job they did for the people, or be off to some warm and happy place where they can enjoy themselves fully.

But make no mistake; the Government is not going to function when we pass this legislation. The Government is simply going to have a Speaker who is going to have authority to put everything over, while nothing happens in the Government. We are going to pay a lot of people, and we are going to pay a lot of people to do nothing. Toxic waste cleanup is not going forward; student loans are not going to be there for our young people; Housing and Urban Development programs, including home purchase loans, are not going to be available; Peace Corps is not going to be funded; Centers for Disease Control is not going to have the money to address the flu outbreak in the Midwest; and the food and shelter program of FEMA is not going to be funded.

This is a phoney program. Vote against it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let us call this resolution for what it is: It is a cynical resolution to allow the Republican Congress to take a vacation; nothing more, nothing less. The Republicans shut the Government down, everybody knows it. No amount of political spin can change it. They are suffering politically for it.

The Speaker tried to relieve the pressure by trying to think about a clean continuing resolution, but last night there was a rebellion in his conference amongst House freshmen Republicans. They will not have any part of it. They are on a crusade, an extreme crusade, but a crusade, so the Government is shut down.

This is to relieve them of that pressure, so there is a resolution to take the political pressure off them. It is a cynical move. Everybody knows we are not coming back until the 23d. The American public will not be fooled by this.

Congress should stay here and do its job. We should pass an absolutely clean continuing resolution to keep the Government open. This is the way it has always been done. The Republicans want to kill Medicare and Medicaid; the Democrats want to protect it. It should not be "our way or no way." Let us stay here and do our job.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not planning on joining this debate today, but I got a phone call in the Cloakroom

about 2 hours ago, and my only daughter-in-law, I have 3 married daughters, a married son, and a single son, and my one son who is married, a beautiful daughter-in-law, they have two children, and she just called me from her place of employment in Virginia and said that she is starting to go into labor. That will be grandchild number 10 today, or in the wee hours of tomorrow morning. The third child, it will probably be today.

This is really what this debate is all about. We talk about it on both sides of the aisle, that we are trying to make this a better country for our grandchildren. Our debt is so enormous, we are really talking about great-grandchildren being saddled with this massive, crushing debt.

If you look at the big picture of what 7 years is really all about, this sounds almost too simple to be believed, but it is true. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to spend \$13 trillion, or at least their leader, Bill Clinton, wants to spend \$13 trillion. What do we plan on spending on this side of the aisle over the next 7 years? We plan on spending \$12 trillion; \$12 trillion here, \$13 trillion there.

Now, everybody agrees that there is too large a Government and too much spending and too many failed programs, and we are stuck here because the man down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, who indicates when he is on the road that he wants to spend only the \$12 trillion, but he will not tell that to this party across the country. He plays games and wants to have it both ways.

Now, my pal, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], and he is my Congressman when I need snow removed around here, is he suggesting that we withhold that \$1.5 billion and not give it to these Federal workers? I do not think he is suggesting that. So he is going to be part of what he calls a bribe. That is not the way to refer to that money.

Mr. Speaker, what are we saying about these workers, some of whom have not been at the job for several weeks? That they are not smart enough to go in and take care of all the administrative burden that they missed over the last 2 weeks, or they cannot catch up on some administrative burden to come?

Look, it has been a given since day one in this debate that no civil servant was going to be denied a nickel of their pay once we resolved this battle in this House. Now, some Federal workers were anxious to get on television, the more nervous types. We all have different personalities. I know some others went on a skiing vacation, a vacation that is not going to come out of their vacation time; maybe a tougher person, more trusting in both parties that we were going to keep our word to pay them their backpay.

But I will tell you this, the dominant media culture, which is liberal from top to bottom, has a profile very similar to one we know in this city: Dodge

the draft; adultery does not count; abortion is superior to any other decision in life, homosexuality is superior to a normal marriage; and graft does not count if it is in politics. This dominant media culture does not want change. They might want a balanced budget by raising enormous sums of taxes, but they don't want change. The media love Clinton and hate Republicans who seek limited government, lower taxes, morality, and a better America.

□ 1545

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, here a few minutes ago, and I want to try to be helpful to him in his pursuits here. He is a good fellow, he works hard, and I think he even means well, but the fact of the matter is what he is asking us to do would be simply wrong.

He is asking us to invest in the Speaker of the House extraordinary powers to recess this House for the next 3 weeks. Now, that would be fine if we could rely upon the Speaker to do the right thing in the first place, which, of course, he has not done. We have not done what we are supposed to do, which is pass a budget.

We shut the Government down and have not been able to pass a resolution which will keep the Government going effectively. The one that has passed only does it piecemeal, part of the way. Things like FHA mortgages are not being processed, small business loans are not being processed, the environment is not being protected or cleaned up. People's health, safety and welfare are being put in jeopardy as a result of the failure of this Government to come to grips with its responsibility.

We want to balance the budget, too, just as much as the Republicans do. As a matter of fact, we have brought the budget closer into balance than it has been in a long, long time. In the last 3 years, the budget deficit has come down by about \$160 billion. That is five times more than what the Republican budget resolution would achieve over the course of the next 3 years.

We want to balance the budget, we just do not want to do it the way they want to do it. What do they want to do? They want to take health care away from elderly people and from the disabled. They want to make it difficult for people to get an education. They want to take education away from children. They want to make it tougher for students to go to college or to stay in college. They want the environment to be degraded. They do not want to protect the environment. We disagree with them on all of these things.

It is not that we do not want to balance the budget, we want to do it in a different way. We want to do it in a

way that protects the elderly, that protects the infirmed and the disabled. We want to do it in a way that ensures that people have educational opportunity so that they can make something of themselves. We want to do it in a way that protects the quality of the natural environment so that people's health and safety are protected as well.

So, therefore, we cannot join them in giving this extraordinary power to the Speaker. We are going to vote no on this resolution.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I am sure the gentleman unintentionally misspoke when he said we have not passed a budget, because this body has passed a budget, and the other body has passed a budget. We sent that budget to the President, and the President chose to veto that budget and he has yet to produce one in its stead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the comments of Grandfather DORNAN from California, and I thought it might be appropriate for Grandfather BARTLETT to make a comment or two.

My friend from California is exactly right, that is what this debate is about. I have 10 children, and we now have 10 grandchildren, and will have several more. Ten years from now, as America looks back at this time, almost nobody will remember that we had a partial government shutdown, but everybody in America is going to remember whether or not we balanced this budget. This is what it is all about, balancing the budget.

The measure before us now is a procedural mechanism to expedite this process. America wants us to balance the budget in overwhelming majority. Let us pass this and get on with the process.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], for yielding time to me.

I am sort of new to this grandfather role that my previous colleagues referred to, but I want to assure my friends that I am very proud of my new grandson, but I am very concerned about the direction that we are going with regards to this rule that is being offered.

I have to agree with my colleagues that we need to get back home and be with the people. We have had a busy year in 1995 and not had enough time to do that. Obviously, many of our Members want to visit in other places in the world and get that type of experience that is vital for the decisions that we must make, but I do not think we should do either under the action being proposed.

This rule really is a rule for crisis, yet this crisis that we have here today

is a self-inflicted crisis. It is the wrong solution. What this rule is an attempt to do is to provide for the expedited procedure where we will not even examine bills in the concurrent resolution that is going to come before the House today which, I might add, is a very defective measure and process. It is an excuse.

Basically, the reason that we acted on the previous emergency Federal Congressional Resolution, the CR, to put the employees back to work and fund some high-profile programs and as my colleagues have commented and then tied their Federal workers' hands so they cannot do their work, which makes no sense at all, the reason that was enacted was so that we could act on this crisis rule and then there would be this 3 week hiatus.

Incidentally, I would point out to my colleagues that the previous CR for putting Federal workers back to work in those selected programs is about the same length as this particular rule. So the whole *modus operandi* here in terms of handing this to the Speaker, is to get the Members out of town, to postpone making decisions and to postpone the work we should be doing on the budget.

And where are we today? I think a little review of the agenda is in order. We are 13 weeks into the fiscal year and the Government has been down for 4 of those 13 weeks. Over 30 percent of the time the Government has been in shutdown or partial shutdown this fiscal year under the Republican leadership in this Congress, which has failed to enact the necessary spending bills for this fiscal year. Failed to enact them. Three of them have not even been presented to the President.

Of course, we get a lot of excuses about that and the straw man arguments about the balanced budget, but those are arguments that should be met and resolved at the negotiating table and reasonable compromise attained.

The Republican Congress has tried repeatedly to make a virtue of shutting down the Government and claiming piously their 7-year balanced budget plan as a heat shield. But the issue isn't a balanced budget—the issue is how do we, the total Federal Government, achieve such goal. For a real agreement rather than a political posture. Neither Democrats or Republicans have a monopoly on precise or correct economic forecasts. This rule simply is an excuse and an attempt in the end to dump the funding problem, and there will be funding problems for numerous Federal programs on the Senate or the President. Let's defeat this rule and work.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of California [Mr. BONO], a distinguished freshman Member.

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

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I am truly fascinated and I enjoy being here be-

cause it is such a thrilling education, and a big part of this education is how people can take basic truths or just basics and twist them and turn them to give impressions that have nothing to do with the issue.

I just heard a statement that the Republicans have shut down the Federal Government under the Republican leadership. It was shut down under the leadership of the President of the United States.

Now, how complicated is this issue? Let me tell my colleagues how complicated this issue is. Why did all this start? It started because we had a position that we should balance the budget. Now, we could lie to the American public and tell them not to worry about it, that they will keep getting their money and they should not worry about it; they will get it forever. But, see, it runs out in 14 years. Everybody admits that. So that is like saying, well, yeah, everything is going to crash, but we should not worry about it.

We are taking all this heat because we are saying to the American people, please be aware that the country is going to crash in 14 years. There will be no money if we operate status quo. It is that simple.

We are saying, well, one way to start handling these problems is to balance the budget. Now, the President says, all right. We will balance, says the President. I sat here and I saw him say we will balance the budget and it should be CBO scored. Well, then we cut a deal, shake hands and wait for the CBO score that the President said he would commit to. The date that he said he would commit to it is gone. He has not committed to it.

Now, what have we done again? We have now again said, okay, let us do this all over again. Mr. President, give us a CBO scored balanced budget in 7 years and we will open up the whole deal. Now, that rests on his shoulders. So what I am saying to my colleagues is, put the appropriation of these problems where they belong. They belong on the President's shoulders.

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

Mr. BONO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, but in my statement, which the gentleman referred to, I said we failed to enact, which, of course, requires the President's signature on appropriations bills. Furthermore, we have not sent 3 of the 13 appropriation bills to the President.

So it is our responsibility, in terms of acting on this, to make certain that these bills, not for 14 years but for this year, in 1996, are enacted.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that. I enjoy those lessons because I learn how to expand language to where we lose communication with the issue, and that was an experience of that.

I am not going to lie to the American public. If we do not address the problem of what is going to happen in 14 years right now, this country will crash, and that is the reality of the situation. We have to do that jointly and we cannot fool the public. It is wonderful to let our numbers go up and say, look, whatever people want, they can get, and they should not worry about it, but we cannot do that.

So I hope this time the same simple message will get to the President and he will submit a balanced budget scored by CBO in 7 years. It is that simple and that would be the end of all of this tribulation.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say, don't be fooled, taxpayers don't be fooled. The Gingrich shutdown is still alive and well. The list of unmet needs goes on and on. And, to add insult to injury, the Gingrich Republicans now want to skip town and leave the American people with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, 198 House Democrats want to keep working to end this shutdown. The other body wants to keep working. For Pete's sake, even BOB DOLE wants to keep working.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that it's the Gingrich Republicans who would rather go home than get this Government up and running again.

Mr. Speaker, for the people of this country and for the honor of this institution, don't even think about sending us home. Our No. 1 job right now is to end this shutdown as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to oppose this foolish resolution.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that this body has done its part and will do its part later on this afternoon to end this shutdown, the Senate has pledged to do its part later on this afternoon to end this shutdown, and then America must look to the President to see if he does his part to end this shutdown.

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

□ 1600

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will you kindly inform the parties as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind everyone who is listening what is being discussed when we discuss this budget impasse.

Mr. Speaker, what is being discussed is not whether we have a balanced budget in 7 years; it is how we balance

the budget. Can we balance it with no tax break, half of which goes to the top 12 percent of income tax earners? Yes, that is how we can balance it, and in 7 years.

In fact, 68 of us who are moderate Democrats in this body have voted for a 7-year balanced budget. Yes, my colleagues heard me correctly, 7 years balanced, but with no tax break. The reason is that tax break money is used to soften the impact on our seniors, on our poor children, on our environmental standards, and on our educational commitments.

We need to make sure that we keep these things in mind as we consider these budget issues. But more than anything else, we need not to do it on the backs of the very people who are going to suffer if we do not get on with this job.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that if we think today's budget decisions are difficult, we just have to wait until our Nation sees the year 2030. If we do nothing, either all Federal taxes would have to be increased by 85 percent or all Federal spending programs would have to be cut by 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is our last, best chance. We must balance the budget, and the President must do his part.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE]. She knows that we were together last evening at the Rules Committee meeting trying to come together in a bipartisan manner to really respond to the needs of the American people, and that is to open the Government fully, not because of any self-serving interests but really to put good public servants back to work for the American people. I know that the American people do not believe that. But so that we can actually do the job that the taxpayers want public servants to do.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have not come to do that today, and it is important to clarify what we are doing right now; why I am in the well of the House right now. This is not a balanced budget vote; this is a go home vote. This is to give to the Speaker of the House the power to play a hide-and-seek game. That is, to hide away the negotiations of the budgeting process so that we will not be able to speak on behalf of those needing Medicare and Medicaid and a clean environment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that their Congress be engaged in this

process. With this martial law, the Speaker of the House is asking for a recess and is saying "I will call you back when I want to think about calling you back."

We are being put in a position as the U.S. Congress to abdicate our responsibilities of give and take in the budgeting process. For those who would think that the President of the United States shut this Government down, we have had on many occasions cleared continuing resolutions placed before the Speaker and he has refused to allow this Congress to vote on it.

Who has ever seen, as documented by the press, not by any Members in this well, an animated and engaged President in the midst of budget negotiations trying to be in front of the bulldozer that is running over student loans, of running over HUD loans, or running over small business assistance loans.

It is important that we face the reality, Mr. Speaker. We must not go home, and we must insist that we fully work. NASA employees, who will be called upon to do another launch next week. They must be able to work fully with the ability to use all resources so we can ensure the complete safety of their launch.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to predict what will happen between the leadership of the Congress and the White House. The purpose of this resolution is to give the House some flexibility in responding to whatever progress is made over the next few weeks and to respond quickly.

It is hard to accept change. It is hard to depart from the status quo. It is hard to keep promises. But I will say again, this is our last, best chance to balance the budget of our country for our children's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to point out that this really is not a vote about going home. This is a vote about opening up Government. This is the vote that gives us the key to getting to that clean, clear, continuing resolution that I keep hearing about from the other side. This is the vote that smooths the pathway to get us to that chance.

So, Mr. Speaker, those who vote "no" on this procedural vote are voting to keep the Government closed and are voting to keep those employees coming to their desks and not having the money to do their jobs, and having that scenario of "the sky is falling" that has been so graphically painted by so many Members on the other side.

So, if Members care about efficient government, if they care about having the opportunity to open it up to get the funds, the services flowing, the people back to work, then they must vote

"yes" on this procedural vote so we can get to the next piece of business before this body, which is, indeed, a continuing resolution that does, I hope, get us to a balanced budget with the President of the United States aboard as a player.

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

The previous question was ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is it appropriate to ask for a parliamentary inquiry at this time before the vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] has already moved the previous question.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet. I just want to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is that out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, before we vote, it has not been explained to me, if this passes, then every 3 days at the end of a recess does there have to be a pro forma session for the Speaker to declare the next 3 days, or whatever, in recess? Does there have to be a pro forma?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution while it is pending and must let the text of the resolution be interpreted by Members of the House.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, is that not a proper parliamentary inquiry? What is the proper parliamentary inquiry then to find out how I want to vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot interpret the pending resolution. The resolution is before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—224

Allard	Bateman	Bunn
Archer	Bereuter	Bunning
Armye	Bilbray	Burr
Bachus	Bilirakis	Burton
Baker (CA)	Bileley	Buyer
Baker (LA)	Blute	Callahan
Ballenger	Boehlert	Calvert
Barr	Boehner	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Campbell
Bartlett	Bono	Canady
Barton	Brownback	Castle
Bass	Bryant (TN)	Chambliss

Chenoweth	Hoekstra	Portman
Christensen	Hoke	Pryce
Clinger	Horn	Quinn
Coble	Hostettler	Radanovich
Collins (GA)	Houghton	Ramstad
Combest	Hunter	Regula
Cooley	Hutchinson	Riggs
Cox	Hyde	Roberts
Crane	Inglis	Rogers
Crapo	Istook	Rohrabacher
Creameans	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Cunningham	Jones	Roukema
Davis	Kasich	Royce
Deal	Kelly	Salmon
DeLay	Kim	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	King	Saxton
Dickey	Kingston	Scarborough
Doolittle	Klug	Schaefer
Dornan	Knollenberg	Schiff
Dreier	Kolbe	Seastrand
Duncan	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Largent	Shadegg
Ehlers	Latham	Shaw
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shays
Emerson	Laughlin	Shuster
English	Lazio	Skeen
Ensign	Leach	Smith (MI)
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Fawell	Linder	Smith (WA)
Flanagan	LoBiondo	Solomon
Foley	Longley	Souder
Forbes	Lucas	Spence
Fowler	Manzullo	Stearns
Fox	Martini	Stump
Franks (CT)	McCollum	Talent
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Tate
Frelinghuysen	McDade	Tauzin
Frisa	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Funderburk	McInnis	Thomas
Galleghy	McIntosh	Thornberry
Gekas	McKeon	Tiahrt
Gilchrist	Metcalf	Torkildsen
Gillmor	Meyers	Upton
Gilman	Mica	Vucanovich
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Waldholtz
Goodling	Molinari	Walker
Goss	Moorhead	Walsh
Graham	Morella	Wamp
Greenwood	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Gunderson	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Gutknecht	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Hancock	Ney	Weller
Hansen	Norwood	White
Hastert	Nussle	Whitfield
Hastings (WA)	Oxley	Wicker
Hayworth	Packard	Wolf
Hefley	Parker	Young (AK)
Heineman	Paxon	Young (FL)
Herger	Petri	Zeliff
Hilleary	Pombo	Zimmer
Hobson	Porter	

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Cramer	Gordon
Ackerman	Danner	Green
Andrews	de la Garza	Gutierrez
Baessler	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Dellums	Hamilton
Barrett (WI)	Deutsch	Harman
Becerra	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Beilenson	Dingell	Hefner
Bentsen	Dixon	Hilliard
Berman	Doggett	Hinchey
Bevill	Dooley	Holden
Bishop	Doyle	Hoyer
Bonior	Durbin	Jackson (IL)
Borski	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	Engel	(TX)
Brewster	Eshoo	Jacobs
Browder	Evans	Jefferson
Brown (CA)	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Cardin	Filner	Kaptur
Chabot	Flake	Kennedy (MA)
Clay	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Clement	Ford	Kennelly
Clyburn	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Coburn	Frost	Klecza
Coleman	Furse	Klink
Collins (IL)	Ganske	LaFalce
Collins (MI)	Gejdenson	Lantos
Condit	Gephardt	Levin
Conyers	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Costello	Gibbons	Lincoln
Coyne	Gonzalez	Lipinski

Lofgren	Ortiz	Skelton
Lowey	Orton	Slaughter
Luther	Owens	Spratt
Maloney	Pallone	Stenholm
Manton	Pastor	Stokes
Markey	Payne (NJ)	Stupak
Martinez	Payne (VA)	Tanner
Mascara	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Matsui	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
McCarthy	Peterson (MN)	Thompson
McDermott	Pickett	Thornton
McHale	Pomeroy	Thurman
McKinney	Poshard	Torres
McNulty	Rahall	Torricelli
Meehan	Rangel	Towns
Meek	Reed	Trafficant
Menendez	Richardson	Velazquez
Mfume	Rivers	Vento
Miller (CA)	Roemer	Visclosky
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Mink	Rush	Ward
Moakley	Sabo	Waters
Mollohan	Sanders	Watt (NC)
Moran	Sawyer	Waxman
Murtha	Schroeder	Williams
Nadler	Schumer	Wise
Neal	Scott	Woolsey
Oberstar	Serrano	Wynn
Obey	Sisisky	Yates
Olver	Skaggs	

NOT VOTING—19

Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Stark
Chapman	Lightfoot	Stockman
Chrysler	Livingston	Studds
Clayton	Montgomery	Wilson
Fazio	Myers	Wyden
Fields (TX)	Quillen	
Hayes	Rose	

Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. TIAHRT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 134, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 336 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 336

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 134) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution.

SEC. 2. House Concurrent Resolution 131 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 3. The Clerk shall not transmit to the Senate a message regarding H.J. Res. 134 until the House has received a message that the Senate has agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 131 as adopted by the House.

The text of the Senate amendment and the motion are as follows:

Senate amendment: