

Gallegly	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Ganske	Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Gejdenson	LoBiondo	Rose
Gekas	Lofgren	Roth
Gephardt	Longley	Roukema
Geren	Lowe	Roybal-Allard
Gilchrest	Lucas	Royce
Gillmor	Luther	Rush
Gillman	Maloney	Sabo
Gonzalez	Manton	Salmon
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sanders
Goodling	Markey	Sanford
Gordon	Martinez	Sawyer
Goss	Martini	Saxton
Green (TX)	Mascara	Schaefer
Greene (UT)	Matsui	Schiff
Greenwood	McCarthy	Schroeder
Gunderson	McCollum	Schumer
Gutierrez	McCrery	Scott
Gutknecht	McHale	Seastrand
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Hamilton	McInnis	Serrano
Hancock	McIntosh	Shadegg
Hansen	McKeon	Shaw
Harman	McKinney	Shays
Hastert	McNulty	Shuster
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sisisky
Hastings (WA)	Meek	Skaggs
Hayes	Menendez	Skeen
Hayworth	Metcalfe	Skelton
Hefley	Meyers	Smith (MI)
Hefner	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Heineman	Millender-	Smith (TX)
Herger	McDonald	Smith (WA)
Hilleary	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hilliard	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hinchey	Minge	Spence
Hobson	Mink	Spratt
Hoekstra	Moakley	Stearns
Hoke	Molinari	Stenholm
Holden	Mollohan	Stokes
Horn	Montgomery	Studds
Hostettler	Moorhead	Stump
Houghton	Moran	Stupak
Hoyer	Morella	Talent
Hunter	Myers	Tanner
Hutchinson	Myrick	Tate
Hyde	Nadler	Tauzin
Inglis	Neal	Taylor (MS)
Istook	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Neumann	Tejeda
Jackson-Lee	Ney	Thomas
(TX)	Norwood	Thompson
Jacobs	Nussle	Thornberry
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thornton
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Tiahrt
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Torkildsen
Johnston	Orton	Torres
Jones	Owens	Towns
Kanjorski	Oxley	Traficant
Kaptur	Packard	Upton
Kasich	Pallone	Vento
Kelly	Parker	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Volkmer
Kennedy (RI)	Paxon	Vucanovich
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Walker
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Walsh
Kim	Pelosi	Wamp
King	Peterson (MN)	Ward
Kingston	Petri	Waters
Klecza	Pombo	Watt (NC)
Klink	Pomeroy	Watts (OK)
Klug	Porter	Waxman
Knollenberg	Portman	Weldon (FL)
Kolbe	Poshard	Weller
LaFalce	Pryce	White
LaHood	Quillen	Whitfield
Lantos	Quinn	Wicker
Largent	Radanovich	Williams
Latham	Rahall	Wilson
LaTourette	Ramstad	Wise
Laughlin	Rangel	Wolf
Lazio	Reed	Woolsey
Leach	Regula	Wynn
Levin	Richardson	Yates
Lewis (CA)	Riggs	Young (AK)
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Young (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Roberts	Zeliff
Lightfoot	Roemer	Zimmer
Linder	Rogers	

NAYS—7

DeFazio	Murtha	Velazquez
Johnson (CT)	Pickett	
McDermott	Stark	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Frank (MA)	Scarborough	Slaughter
------------	-------------	-----------

NOT VOTING—12

Brewster	Graham	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Stockman
Flake	Lincoln	Torricelli
Gibbons	McDade	Weldon (PA)

□ 1759

Mr. 5 MURTHA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from "yea" to "present."

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote on passage of H.R. 3666. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of final passage on the VA-HUD bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT
OF HOUSE AND SENATE FOR
INDEPENDENCE DAY DISTRICT
WORK PERIOD

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 465

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to 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 purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 465 provides for the consideration in the House of a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period. All points of order are waived against the resolution and its consideration.

Because of the many open rules that have been granted by this Congress' Rules Committee—60 percent have been open or modified open—which have led to many vigorous but lengthy debates and amending processes on the floor, the House has not yet been able to complete action on all of the appropriations bills and reconciliation legislation. Therefore, while adjournment

resolutions are usually privileged, a rule is needed to waive the point of order that could be raised against the Fourth of July district work period resolution on the grounds that it violates sections 309 and 310(f) of the Budget Act. These sections prohibit the House of Representatives from adjourning for more than 3 days in July unless the House has completed action on all appropriations bills and any required reconciliation legislation.

In addition, it should be noted that adjournment resolutions are not debatable, and upon adoption of this rule, the House proceeds to a vote on the adjournment resolution itself without further debate.

Mr. Speaker, the House has completed as many of the appropriations bills as possible, and we are over half-way there. The House has approved the appropriations measures for military construction, foreign operations, Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and VA-HUD and tonight, we will work on the transportation bill, and the remaining appropriations and reconciliation measures are to be considered in a timely matter after next week. We have certainly made progress with the administration during this year's appropriations cycle over last year's process, and I am confident that the House will continue to make appropriate spending decisions after the Independence Day district work period.

Independence Day is a time to be back in our districts, celebrating the birth of this great Nation, and listening to what our constituents have to say about the issues that are important to them.

The Congress has very important spending decisions to make, with limited funds, and time spent in our districts listening to the priorities of our constituents will be very worthwhile. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is totally reasonable that the House return to our districts for the Independence Day work period, to reflect together with our constituents on the principles put forth by our Founding Fathers in 1776 that form the basis of our limited, representative Government.

I urge adoption of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make something perfectly clear, we are voting on this recess rule because, once again, the Republicans have not done their job.

This rule will waive provisions of law that require the Congress to get its work done before it recesses for July 4.

So, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues barely managed to fulfill their responsibility last year and it looks like they might not get it done this year either.

Congress' primary responsibility is to pass 13 appropriations bills so that the Federal Government can function.

Section 309 of the Budget Act says the House cannot leave for July 4 until all 13 appropriations bills are passed. But, since my Republican colleagues have spent their time cutting Medicare and education to pay for tax breaks for the very rich, they haven't finished all of the appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, after last year's budget fiasco I hoped my Republican colleagues would have learned their lesson.

After Speaker GINGRICH closed the Government not once, but twice. After Speaker GINGRICH had to pass an unprecedented 13 continuing resolutions last year in order to buy time, I had hoped my Republican colleagues would decide to join us in putting families first this year.

But it looks like we're not there yet.

Last year the Contract on America was holding things up. Now, despite the contract's fizzling out, my Republican colleagues have only finished 7 of the 13 appropriations bills they were supposed to finish.

That is not the way Congress is supposed to run, Mr. Speaker.

And that's not the way the Democrats ran things.

During the last session in which the Democrats were in charge, 12 appropriations bills had passed the House by June 29. The last bill passed the House 2 weeks later.

And, contrary to what some may assert, the inability of the Republicans to get their job done has nothing to do with open or closed rules. This year, 60 percent of the rules have been restrictive. We haven't been spending time openly discussing and amending legislation.

Instead, my Republican colleagues have made enormous cuts in education, Medicare, and environmental protection, most to pay for tax breaks for the very rich.

Mr. Speaker, that's not what the American people want. They want their needs to be given priority over the needs of the special interests, and they want Congress to stay until it gets the job done.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule. My Republican colleagues should do the work they were sent here to do.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that in one of his essays, George Orwell wrote that "Hypocrisy is the British vice." Our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, seems to adamantly wish to replicate that trait in this House. I went back just three Congresses, Mr. Speaker, three Congresses, 6 years, in reviewing the record on this issue of the Fourth of July break. Not once, not once during those 6 years, not once were all 13 appropriations bills passed at the time of the July recess.

Mr. Speaker, do Members know how many times we, when we were in the minority, failed to grant the majority unanimous consent on this issue? Not once. So I maintain that George Orwell's trait, when he referred to it as a British trait is being replicated at this point at this time in this House.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame we have to be here wasting an hour on this adjournment resolution. I have never in my 18 years here heard such crybabies. What do the very rich have to do with this adjournment thing? On that side of the aisle, they seem to think that anybody with a job is very rich. Do Members know what I think? I think many of the Members who have never run a business ought to resign and ought to go out and meet a payroll. Then I do not think we would hear this "very, very rich" business anymore.

Let me just reinforce what my colleague on the Committee on Rules has just pointed out. That is that the Democrats have no grounds for complaints about this Fourth of July, Independence-Day-adjournment resolution, given their own track record.

Let us look at the facts. Our earlier studies show that not once in the last 6 years of the Democrat-controlled Congress in this House did they meet the July recess deadline for completing action on the 13 appropriation bills; as the gentleman just said, not once. So what are they standing up here crying for, and making all these absurd statements?

Since I thought that might be unfair to the Democrats to only go back 6 years, today I had the staff go back at least 10 years. We can go back 40, if Members want to. Sure enough, in one of those years, 1988, they actually did complete House action on all 13 appropriation bills by the July recess, once, back in 1988. Did the Members remember that? I was here, I remember it. I see the gentleman's hand go up, he remembers it. In all fairness to the Democrats, they did meet the deadline under the Budget Act at one time in their last decade in control of this House. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

How does that compare to the Republican 104th Congress? While the average number of appropriation bills the Democrats passed by the July recess in their last 10 years was 6.2, our average, counting today's transportation appropriation bill, which will finish about midnight tonight because of the wasted time here on this foolish bill, we have completed 7 last year, 6 this year. That averages out to more than they did over all those years, gentlemen.

So notwithstanding the fact that we still are rather new at all this, we have only been at it about 18 months now, we are still doing better than those guys did all these years. Mr. Speaker, what is really disturbing is the Demo-

crats would take the time of this House of forcing this matter into the Committee on Rules for a special rule, just so they can say they are making some kind of an issue here.

□ 1815

Our survey of the last 10 years of Democratic control shows that in each year of that decade, the Republican minority, that was us then, permitted these resolutions to come up on the floor under a unanimous-consent statement. We did not waste all of this body and paying all of this overtime to all of these people on this foolish resolution. We acted instead in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation. That is comity. Remember what it used to sound like?

We used to have some comity in this body. So it is indeed sad that the Democrats have stooped to this to make a partisan issue on this Independence Day.

I am going to tell my colleagues something. I live up in the Hudson Valley. I represent the Catskills and the Adirondack Mountains. That is where the Revolutionary War was fought, Independence Day, July 4. I want you to come up and see where General John Burgoyne surrendered to Horatio Gates. That was the turning point. That was the battle that made this the greatest, freest Nation on earth.

What are we fooling around here for? All of us pack up our bags and let us go home. Let us see what it is really like back home, and let us stop talking very, very, very much. I never heard such goings-on. I will back up with fact this study, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring that up is because the Republicans said they were going to run the Committee on Rules completely different. They were going to run the Congress completely different. And they have not. That is why 60 percent of the rules have been closed and they have not brought the appropriation bills forward. So they are not doing what they said they would do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to not talk so much about the past but about the present and the future.

The situation, as this chart shows, is that, if we take a look at what has happened to each of the 13 appropriation bills that we are supposed to be passing this fiscal year, so far 7 of them, those in red that reach this line here, 7 of them by the end of the day will have passed the House. Only one will have passed the Senate. There are three more which are moving their way through the Committee on Appropriations, and there are three which have not yet begun the move through the Committee on Appropriations. So that means that 7 out of the 13 will be passed through the House by the end of the day.

That is absolutely not the fault of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] or the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations. But I do think we need to look at what the problems are so that we can try to deal with them.

The problem, the main problem is that, first of all, the budget resolution was 2 months late. Because of that, the Committee on Appropriations has been forced to do in approximately 3 weeks time what ordinarily would take about 10 weeks to accomplish. That is in my view the price that was paid for the extremism that was reflected in the general budget resolution. Even the Republican majority in the Senate could not take the extremism represented by the House-passed budget resolution, and they demanded substantial changes. It took a long time to get them. That put us behind.

Second, we also have what I would describe as the "my-way-or-no-way" mentality, which still apparently dominates the majority party caucus in this House on a number of these appropriation bills. Example: Just last night we had an effort made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] to offer an amendment which would have repaired the problems on the VA-HUD bill.

The subcommittee chairman, Mr. LEWIS, graciously recognized that we had a problem and tried to deal with it, but he was overcome by the extremists in his own caucus. So they would up refusing to provide the major fix-ups that everybody knows are going to be necessary in that VA-HUD bill if the bill is ever going to become law. If those fix-ups are not made, we are simply going to have a bill that goes nowhere.

Just this morning in the Committee on Appropriations on the Treasury, Post Office bill, accommodation was reached on several items. But it has been made quite clear by the Treasury Department and by the Committee on Ways and Means, for instance, if I could add that, that the committee is insisting on extreme actions with respect to dictating how the IRS goes about modernization. They are insisting on taking actions which the Republican leadership on the Committee on Ways and Means says will lead to a loss of revenue. And if you have a loss of revenue, you are going to have an addition to the deficit. Yet when efforts were made to try to fix that problem, they were all rejected. So it is "our-way-or-no-way."

Again, it is quite clear from my conversations with Treasury that that bill will not see the light of day. It will never become law unless it is repaired so that we do not damage the ability of the IRS to collect the taxes that are due under law.

The Interior appropriation bill, because of the extreme allocation provided, has already been put on the veto list. In addition to that, the Labor HEW bill, because of the woefully inadequate allocation winds up providing

\$2.5 billion less for education alone than the President is requesting. That is going to mean a long stalemate unless we have a much more flexible attitude exhibited by the majority party in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a little bit of history here. The last year that our party controlled this House, I chaired the Committee on Appropriations. We passed every single appropriation bill before the end of the fiscal year, every single one. Now, we did not do that because of any peculiar wisdom on my part. We did it because my party leadership allowed me to cross the aisle, go to the Republican leadership on the committee and work out a bipartisan allocation under the 602 budget process under which we agreed on a bipartisan basis how much money would go into each of those 13 spending bills. Because we had reached bipartisan agreement, we were able to pass all 13 of those appropriation bills on time.

The leadership of the Committee on Appropriations was never allowed to do that this year because of the extreme agenda already referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which requires that we squeeze every last dollar out of education and every last dollar out of job training in order to fund tax cuts for people making \$200,000 a year. That is the problem. Until that is gotten over by the majority party in this House, it is not going to be possible to pass these bills, and we risk running into the same kind of chaos that we had last year.

I would remind by colleagues that there are only 31 working days left before the end of the fiscal year. Can anybody tell me they really believe we are going to be able to finish all 13 appropriation bills, half of which are not yet through the House, only one of which is through the Senate, unless we get a far more flexible and a far more bipartisan attitude on the part of the majority than we have gotten to date?

Now, I know that the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations has tried everything possible to get their bills done on time, but they cannot be expected to perform legislatively impossible acts. When the leadership on the majority side does not understand the realities of passing appropriations legislation, then they put the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations in an impossible situation; and no matter how hard they try, they cannot deliver on an impossible set of orders.

So I would suggest, I know there is plenty of goodwill on the part of the majority on the Committee on Appropriations, and I know that people are used to being workhorses on the committee. They are used to trying to work things out in ways which make reasonable accommodations to people who happen to sometimes disagree with them. We had to do it when we were in control of the House. I would suggest that the majority party needs to understand that we had to do it when we were in the House if we want-

ed to get things done on time and if we wanted to get things done in a way which brings credit to this House.

So I think it is essential that we have a more reasonable attitude demonstrated by the majority leadership in this House. I think it is essential that we recognize that there are going to have to be major changes in the budget allowances provided these bills, because the President is not going to accept and the country is not going to accept short sheeting education, short sheeting job training, short sheeting other programs that are needed by middle class working people in order to provide \$11 billion more than the President and the Pentagon are asking for, and in order to salt away money for tax cuts for high-income people. That just is not going to happen.

So if my colleagues want to know what is in store for us, recognize we are only halfway home in passing the bills through the House. Our principal obligation under the Constitution in this Congress is to pass our appropriation bills. I plead with my colleagues, we cannot get that done unless there is a much more flexible attitude on the part of the top party leadership in this House so that we can reach reasonable bipartisan accommodation and get the job done the way the country expects us to get the job done.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize the longer we take discussing this rule, the longer it will be until we can get to the seventh appropriation bill, the seventh appropriation bill, which we want to pass tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for allotting me the time to address some of the statements that have been made previously.

First of all, I think we should start out with the preceding speaker, who keeps using on a routine basis the word short cheating. I am not sure what short cheating is, but I can tell the previous speaker that shortchanging is exactly what he is doing to the American people by continuing to frivolously argue a procedural motion. This is a motion that, when we were in the minority for at least the 6 years that we have researched, we never had a debate like this. We did it on a unanimous resolution.

Let me give my colleagues the history of what we have here, the criticism we are receiving. Let us first of all talk about what it is we are debating. What we are debating is a very simple management procedure, and

that is to put this House in adjournment so that the Members of this House can go back to their districts on July 4 and work in their districts. Very simple. Very noncontroversial. Every year except now. All of a sudden it is a golden opportunity to whine about the majority.

Well, let us look at what we did, when we were in the minority and they were in the majority on the July 4 resolution for adjournment.

In the 99th Congress, the first session, did they have a special rule for this? No. We did it on unanimous consent. Did they have their appropriation bills passed? No. The 99th, second session. Did we require a special rule? No. Did they have their number of appropriations bills passed? No. On the 100th, for the first and second session both, did we require a special rule? No. Did they have their appropriations passed? No. The same thing for the 101st. The same thing for the 102d. The same thing for the 103d.

Why are my colleagues trying to stall this? This is not a game. We need to get to work.

Last night Members on both sides of the aisle in this House worked until 2 o'clock. Tonight, especially the way it is going right now, we will probably be here until 2 o'clock again. These people need to get back to their districts. This is not a controversial issue.

What has happened is, some Members have captured this as an issue to cry about being in the minority, to stand up and whine and whine. Frankly, we are not accomplishing anything.

Let us make a couple of points of clarification. The gentleman preceding me is a very good speaker. He brought up a nice chart, it looks great. He talked about how when he was on the Committee on Appropriations, when he was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, why they were able to pass all of these bills by the end of the fiscal year.

Well, we are not talking about the end of the fiscal year on July 4. That comes on September 30. That is still several months away. We need to compare apples to apples. When we compare apples to apples, we find that the minority cooperated, and that is a word that we ought to use around here, cooperated with the majority when we were in the minority for the July 4 adjournment so that Members could go back to their districts for the July 4 holiday, although, as all of us know, it is not really a holiday because we participate in parades and we want to work our districts, and I think we should work our districts.

□ 1830

I think it is also very important to note, and I hear it again from the preceding speaker, about on one hand the gentleman says we need to have more cooperation around here. On the other hand, taking a look at the record of the gentleman's comments, probably every fifth sentence he turns around and

calls it extreme positions, the extremists over here, the short-cheating, these kind of verbal attacks. That is not going to get us anywhere. Let us cooperate. We have got a lot of work left yet to do tonight and I think we need to focus on that work. I think we would much better spend our time dealing with issues of substance instead of arguing about a simple management procedural resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply note for the gentleman's attention that three Members of your own caucus have described what you did on the budget last year as being silly extremism and I agree with them.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am stunned genuinely to hear the last speaker refer to whining, to refer to crying. I find even more stunning the comments of the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee referring to crybabies. I had thought that would be an incident that our Republican colleagues would just as soon forget, because all America knows there was only one crybaby involved in all this and that is what finally led to the Government shutdown last November.

Mr. Speaker, I think that America can look at what is happening here tonight and can say in short, "Been there, done that." We had your hurry-up-and-stop approach to government all of the last year. Where did it lead America? It led us down the road to two very costly Government shutdowns, and when all was said and done and we followed your path, the American taxpayer got a bill for \$1.5 billion of wasted taxpayer money because you did not do your job and then a crybaby came along and pouted and we ended up with a Government shutdown and no budget.

The law on this is very clear. You are such revolutionaries apparently you would believe in flouting the law instead of following the law. The law does not say anything to prevent Mr. SOLOMON from going to upstate New York and talking to all the other revolutionaries that he might want to talk to. It says you can take 3 days and have your watermelon and your apple pie and make your Fourth of July speech but if you do not have your work done, come back to Washington and get it done.

The only reason that you are having to offer this resolution is you do not want to do that work. You do not want to follow the Budget Act that is written into our law. If you did that, you would not need this resolution. You profess so much concern about the budget, about getting it balanced, about protecting future generations. I share that concern.

Mr. Speaker, it is unique that the gentleman from Cleveland would ask me to yield. He is the one who raised the crybaby point last November when a crybaby did lead to the problems that we have in this country.

Mr. HOKE. Will the gentleman yield since he used my name?

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time I will yield for the full 30 minutes but on my time I want to talk about the way you are flouting the law, flouting the Congressional Budget Act. If you think that act is inappropriate, then change the law, but it is on the books.

Tonight we find that only half of the appropriations bills have been passed, and we further find that our Republican colleagues, including those who have asked me to yield, have boasted of the fact that they do not plan to complete their work, never planned to complete it, because, purely for political advantage, they have decided to wait until September, not until July as the law requires but to wait until September to even bring up the last reconciliation act, so they plan to provide us the same old kind of brinksmanship that led to the Government shutdown, that led to the crybaby incident, that produced the failure of the last Congress. I think America does not want a repeat of that kind of failure. It cost us too much before, and it resulted in a great deal of pain and anguish for millions of American citizens. I know it takes you time to get this job done, especially when you want to cut Medicare and you want to cut education and you want to put all these restrictions on enforcing our environmental laws. It takes a lot of time to figure out how to do it. But it is wrong and you ought to stay here and get your job done.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened with wonder to the other side, I thought it was the water for a while, but no, Mr. Speaker, it is the political calendar. And what marvelous, weird things the political calendar can do. Not once over the last 6 years did they finish their appropriations bills, and we always gave them unanimous consent. Now at least the distinguished former chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished ranking member said, "Well, we thought that they would be different."

The reality of the matter is we are different because we are balancing the budget. At least we expected them to be in one way similar to how we were, and, that is, in essential courtesy. But they did not grant us unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I heard with great dismay the other side of the aisle, some of the previous speakers, talk about the Republican extreme agenda. I want to talk about the Republican agenda and respond to their comments. I have heard that, I hope,

for the last time. They talk about Republican proposed changes in education, in job training, environment, and welfare. I want to talk about my perspective and how I came here and what I saw and what we tried to do.

First of all, let us look at education. We did not propose any cuts over the next 7 years in education. We actually proposed an increase in expenditures of \$24 billion. It is not just how much money you spend on education or any other program. We are spending more money, billions of hard earned taxpayers' dollars on education, we are spending more on programs for education. The question is how you spend the money and what results you get.

Let us look at the results. Our children have diplomas they cannot read. I have 71 percent of my students in central Florida in one community college requiring remedial education upon entry. Is that success? We are paying for metal detectors in our schools instead of teachers. We have built an administrative bureaucracy, starting in Washington, in Atlanta, in Tallahassee, where we are paying administrators and we do not have money to pay teachers. Teachers and students are our last priority. It is this bureaucracy that we have built and we are supporting that the American people do not want.

Job training. Here is an article from several weeks ago in my local paper. This is a State of Florida report. State and Federal governments spend about \$1 billion a year on vocational job programs in my State. Less than 20 percent of those who enter the job training program ever complete it. Of that, 19 percent get a job.

This is what the argument is about here. This is what it is about. We are spending incredible amounts of money, our people are out busting their buns sending taxpayer dollars here, and the job training programs in my State, one State, \$1 billion, a total failure.

This is what the argument is about. This is what the shutdown was about, because for 40 years they did it their way, and this is the result. I have students that cannot read. You try to employ someone and get them with basic skills and you cannot do it.

The environment. We had a debate here yesterday about the environment. Superfund, supposed to clean up hazardous waste sites. What has it done? The money has gone for attorneys and studies. In Florida, we have one hazardous waste site that has had six project managers. One of the project managers came back and is now a consultant.

I sat on the committee that oversees the EPA, and you will find that the people that work now as consultants are former EPA employees, about 80 to 90 percent of them. An incestuous relationship.

A GAO study last year said that the sites that they picked to clean up, the few that they clean up, are not the sites that pose the most risk to our children's health and our public safety.

Is what we are doing with your dollars, your taxpayer dollars in the environment, what we have done, what we have set up, is it effective? The answer is no. You are paying more and getting less. Forty years of tax-and-spend. They tried taxing you even more here.

I submit the reason the American people feel like they have less is because they have less, because they have taxed you more in the past 3 years. You have less, you have less opportunity, and you have less left over in your paycheck, whether you are a senior citizen and they taxed your Social Security, whether they gave more money to those who wash up on our shores illegally than they gave in benefits to our veterans.

That is what this is about. It took shutting government down. And then the President tried to embarrass us. He was as guilty as anyone in the process. He did not want to work together. He wanted to make political advantage of it. This is what it is about.

Then Medicare. They destroyed Medicare. They are watching it die on the vine and they do not care about it. I have family members who are senior citizens that depend on Medicare. We want to save Medicare. We want to protect Medicare. They want to destroy it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair tell me how much time the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] and I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 12½ minutes remaining, and gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the gentleman who just spoke talk about how it took shutting the Government down. It was their deliberate action to shut the Government down twice, and to provide the American people with the pain that they felt in the United States Government being shut down. By their own admission, they deliberately shut the Government down.

As for withering on the vine, we know whose quote that is. The Speaker of the House has talked about Medicare withering on the vine, that "We cannot go after it in this round, but we go after it next year, so in fact it will wither on the vine," destroying Medicare for the people today and tomorrow who depend on the Medicare system.

Also the gentleman from Florida spoke of Republicans balancing the budget. Well, my friends, on the contrary, the exact opposite is true. Republicans passed the budget in this House 2 weeks ago that in fact increased the deficit for each of the next 2 years by \$40 billion.

By their own admission, the Republican freshmen revolted. They said they did not come here to increase the deficit, that in fact they came here to

balance the budget, and they revolted. However, some of them had their arms twisted so that in fact the Republican majority could pass a budget that increases the deficit over the next 2 years. Let us get the facts straight.

Mr. Speaker, the adjournment resolution has been made necessary by the majority's failure to make the progress required under the Budget Act. This resolution is the perfect commentary for a Congress whose legacy is a failure to live up to its fiduciary responsibility to tend to the public interest. Half of the annual appropriations bills have not been passed by this Chamber.

□ 1845

The Speaker and the Republican majority, they want to go home for a Fourth of July vacation. They shut the Government down again by their own admission today, and they had to do it.

Mr. Speaker, last year Speaker GINGRICH shut down the Government, went home for Christmas vacation, and now the Republican majority wants us to pass this resolution. It is a little bit like getting a note from home, letting them off the hook because they have not done their homework.

This is the Republican revolution, and when will these revolutionaries grow up and take their responsibilities to the American people seriously? Commerce, State, Energy and Water, Treasury, Postal, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the list of unfinished business goes on and on and on for the last 20 months. They have not fooled the American public where they have said that what they truly want to do is to cut Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. That is what the last 19 months has been about, and in the last month, they capped it off with passing a budget that increases the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues, vote against this resolution. Let us stay on the job until the people's business is done in the people's House.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we want to get back to work. We never, when we were in the minority, took up an hour on this procedural motion. Obviously, they have the procedural right to do this if they so wish, and they are doing it. It is a shame because we want to get to work on the seven appropriations bill which we have to ready for consideration in the House, the transportation appropriations bill.

But not all Members on the other side of the aisle want to refuse to go to work. As a matter of fact, I would like to recognize for a couple of minutes at this point the distinguished gentleman from the other side of the aisle but who wants to go to work, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get in the middle of a balanced budget debate. Quite frankly, I

do not think either party is going to balance the budget. I think people are going to be looking for jobs in Mexico the way things are going around here.

I have been here a number of years, and I think there was only 1 year under Jim Wright where we had all of these appropriation bills done by July 4th. The American taxpayers and workers have to work till July 3 to pay for Federal taxes, State taxes, local taxes, and for the regulatory burden they have; July 3.

We have staff around here that is burned out. Democrats very rarely finish their programs by the Fourth of July. I dearly love the ranking chairman, the former chairman of the Committee on Rules. This is no slight to the chairman. I am going to vote for the rule. I am going to vote for the resolution. I am going to vote to adjourn. The Republican Party is at least working on these particular issues. I think we have gone an hour on this. Quite frankly, I have never seen this happen before. Now, my last recollection was 1998, Jim Wright, we had all these appropriation bills done on time. We have set no record ourself. I am going to vote for the rule, and I am going to vote for the resolution.

I think as a body we should consider the staff that works here. Sometimes they go till 3 in the morning, get back at 7, and I think we should be a little more considerate.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Speaker, there are times when we are in our office working away and we hear one of the speeches on the floor coming over that C-SPAN channel and we are compelled to set the record straight. It is indeed this feeling of being compelled to set the record straight that brings me forward to address the rule before us.

While my preceding speaker, my colleagues and friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], acknowledged that it may be unusual to have all the appropriations bills done by this point in time, I would make the point that we have never, ever seen such a debacle with the handling of appropriations bills that we saw in the first year of this 104th Congress.

This House of Representatives has never, ever shut the Federal Government of this country down because it could not, would not get work done. That is the sorry legacy of the 104th Congress, and I do not think it is too much to expect that they would therefore try to get it done by the time the law says it has to be done, not have to come to the floor, ever chomping at the bit to climb on some airplane and fly home and waive the law, waive the completion requirement for getting the appropriations business done.

In light of the record of this Congress, we have got to wonder, I think

the American taxpayers have to wonder, just what is coming, what can they expect. Another shutdown when at the end of the fiscal year the work has yet to be completed?

There are some fact issues that have been egregiously misrepresented. Those include funding for education and training. In fact, I heard a preceding speaker allege that any suggestions that reductions in education funding simply are false statements. Well, let me tell my colleagues, those statements are the false statements. In fact, overall education and training budget authority is \$60 billion below the President's plan for 1996 through 2002. The Republican funding cut for fiscal year 1996 through 2002 is \$58 billion in real terms, or 19 percent below the 1995 enacted level. Nineteen percent below the 1995 enacted level. Nineteen percent below the 1995 enacted level, and we have a suggestion that there has been no reduction in education funding. Hogwash. There is a record here, and a record some of our colleagues might want to deny, but the fact of the matter is a record very firmly established, and the record is there have been cuts to education.

Medicare, oh, we are going to hear a lot in the next few months about people's concern about Medicare, but the fact of the matter is there was a resolution that passed this Congress that cut Medicare \$270 billion. Our colleagues say it had to do with fixing the trust fund. Well, we know what it had to do with. It had to do with funding a \$245 billion tax cut, disproportionately benefiting the wealthiest people in this country. It is a record, a record of the 104th Congress and, if I was in the majority, not a record to be very proud of.

There are a number of other examples. The reduction in earned income tax credit, the proposed \$17 billion tax increase to working families. All of these have constituted the record of this Congress.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, all of this, with all of those failures, all those attempts to wreck education, to wreck Medicare, what they call reconciliation, which was the right name for that bill that they did that it, all of that and then they have come, have they not, this year and they are actually increasing the budget deficit with the bills that they have proposed and not passed, they are going to increase the budget deficit this year after we had it on the path the last 4 years coming down every single year under Democratic leadership.

This year they have passed a bill to increase the deficit this year, then to do it again next year. Maybe that is why they want to go home: they are not too proud of the increases that they proposed this year and next year.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

As we know, they barely passed that budget resolution, and now we read in the Washington Post today the Speaker has convened a team of Pentagon officers on loan to do an after-action review, military jargon for "how come it was such a close call?" I could tell the Speaker if he would just call me. It was a close call because it did not drop the deficit toward a balanced budget, it raised the deficit. The Speaker is going to send home Members of his own caucus; the only record they will have in advancing toward a balanced budget is the deficit going up on their watch. That is why the Speaker barely passed his budget.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe that the more the American people find out about these failures of this Congress that some of these folks are going to have an opportunity to go home for a lot longer than 3 days.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, being one of those Members who just happened to walk in, having been one of those Members who happened to be back in his office watching C-SPAN and being compelled to come to the floor to respond to the last speaker and his comments, I have to say that I am compelled to set the record straight.

We have just completed six bills in the appropriations cycle. We are going to complete the seventh tonight, the seventh, I remind the Members, before the July 4 recess.

And how interesting it is I have in my hand a record of the last five Congresses. I have to say the gentleman who preceded me might have been right; in the 103d Congress, both sessions, they did exceed the number of bills that we have had, but in the 102d, second session, the Democrats only passed six bills out of the House before the July 4 recess. In the 101st Congress, they missed in both sessions. In the second session, it was only three. In the first session it was only one.

Now, they did it all right in the 100th Congress, in the second session. But in the first session, they only passed six. And my goodness, in the 99th Congress, if I do recall correctly, the Democrats controlled not only the 99th but the 98th and the 97th all the way back for 40 years, and they had had a lot of practice. They had had a lot of practice, but they only passed one single appropriation bill in the second session and guess how many in the first session. I am shocked: zero. Zero appropriation bills before the Fourth of July.

Let us hear about this appalling record. In not only the 103d, the 102d,

the 101st, all the way back, do my colleagues know that since World War II, they only balanced the budget about three times, three single years? And all those other years they spent more than they received, sometimes as much as \$100 billion a year, sometimes as much as \$200 billion a year, sometimes as much as 300 or more billion dollars a year. And they aggregated about \$5 trillion worth of debt.

Now, did they do anything about it? Did they sit in their office and feel compelled by their viewing of C-SPAN to come to the floor and condemn a record that accumulated \$5 trillion worth of debt? Did they feel compelled to scream out about the \$20,000 debt imposed upon every man, woman, and child in America? No, of course not. They would pass another program. They would establish another agency. They would create another department. They would go home for the Fourth of July and say, "Look what I have done for you with your money. We

are going to borrow more money." That is what they accomplished. They accomplished a record of profligate spending unparalleled by any nation in the world. What they have accomplished is giving our children a legacy that they will not be able to repay.

Now, this July 4, we can go home because of the record of the 104th Congress and we can say we passed a series of rescission bills in the spring of 1995 that cut \$20 billion from what was appropriated by the previous Democrat Congress. In the fall, yes, the process took a long time, and I am sorry that it made all of us work so hard, and I am sorry that the President vetoed three bills, and I am sorry that the Democrats filibustered the biggest bill, the Labor-Health bill in the Senate. But the 1996 process saved the American people another \$23 billion. We are midway through the 1997 process, and I hope we are going to save another \$15 to \$20 billion.

So below what was appropriated by the Democrats in the last Congress in which they had control, we have saved the American taxpayer some \$60 billion. If you look at the budget projected by the President, had he had that spendthrift Congress, we have saved about \$80 billion. That is a record.

□ 1900

That is a record on which we can be very, very proud for the Fourth of July.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process.

I would like to point out that 60 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

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

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive	2R: 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (0J)	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive	8D: 7R.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive	1D: 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive	5D: 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open	N/A.
H.R. 535	Coming National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive	3D: 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act; FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive	36R: 18D: 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive	5R: 4D: 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open	N/A
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open	N/A
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open	N/A
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open	N/A
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS)	H. Res. 222	Open	N/A
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open	N/A
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive	2R/2D.
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open	N/A
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open	N/A
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open	N/A
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open	N/A
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform	H. Res. 245	Restrictive	1D.
H. Con. Res. 109	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A
H.R. 1833	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 2546	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive	5R.
H.R. 2586	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed	2R.
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia	N/A	Closed	1D: 2R.
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed	N/A
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act ..	H. Res. 313	Open	N/A
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995	H. Res. 323	Closed	N/A
PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION				
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria	H. Res. 334	Closed	N/A
H.J. Res. 134	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134	H. Res. 336	Closed	N/A
H. Con. Res. 131	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts	H. Res. 338	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive	5D: 9R: 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H. Res. 368	Open rule: Rule tabled	N/A
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States	H. Res. 371	Closed rule	N/A
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H. Res. 372	Restrictive	2D/2R
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive	6D: 7R: 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive	12D: 19R: 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed	N/A
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996	H. Res. 388	Closed	N/A
H.R. 3136	The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996	H. Res. 391	Closed	N/A
H.R. 3103	The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996	H. Res. 392	Restrictive	N/A
H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment	H. Res. 395	Restrictive	1D
H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	H. Res. 396	Open	N/A
H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996	H. Res. 409	Open	N/A
H.R. 1675	National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995	H. Res. 410	Open	N/A
H.J. Res. 175	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 411	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2641	United States Marshals Service Improvement Act of 1996	H. Res. 418	Open	N/A
H.R. 2149	The Ocean Shipping Reform Act	H. Res. 419	Open	N/A
H.R. 2974	To amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims	H. Res. 421	Open	N/A
H.R. 3120	To amend Title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering	H. Res. 422	Open	N/A
H.R. 2406	The United States Housing Act of 1996	H. Res. 426	Open	N/A
H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996	H. Res. 427	Open	N/A
H.R. 3286	The Adoption Promotion and Stability Act of 1996	H. Res. 428	Restrictive	1D: 1R
H.R. 3230	Defense Authorization Bill FY 1997	H. Res. 430	Restrictive	41 amends: 20D: 17R: 4 bipartisan
H.R. 3415	Repeal of the 4.3-Cent Increase in Transportation Fuel Taxes	H. Res. 436	Closed	N/A
H.R. 3259	Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1997	H. Res. 437	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 3144	The Defend America Act	H. Res. 438	Restrictive	1D.
H.R. 3448/H.R. 1227	The Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act of 1996	H. Res. 440	Restrictive	2R.
H.R. 3517	Military Construction Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 442	Open	N/A
H.R. 3540	Foreign Operations Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 445	Open	N/A
H.R. 3562	The Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act	H. Res. 446	Restrictive	N/A
H.R. 2754	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act	H. Res. 448	Restrictive	1R
H.R. 3603	Agriculture Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 451	Open	N/A
H.R. 3610	Defense Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 453	Open	N/A
H.R. 3662	Interior Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 455	Open	N/A
H.R. 3666	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 456	Open	N/A
H.R. 3675	Transportation Appropriations FY 1997	H. Res. 460	Open	N/A
H.J. Res. 182/H.Res. 461	Disapproving MFN Status for the Peoples Republic of China	H. Res. 463	Closed	N/A
H. Res. 465	Making in order a Concurrent Resolution Providing for the Adjournment of the House over the 4th of July district work period	H. Res. 465	Closed	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 60% restrictive; 40% open. All legislation 104th Congress, 56% restrictive; 44% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that in the wake of the last speech, I was not aware that we were

supposed to be cheerleaders at what sounds like a high school football game.

Keep going. It is in character.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this does not come out of my time, but I hope you would educate Members of the House that they have an obligation to not speak unless they are in the well or at the microphone.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem, and we ought to discuss it in a rational way. Members may not like what I said when I spoke earlier, but I think if they review the text of what I said, that I was exceedingly fair to the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations on that side of the aisle.

I tried to analyze what the problems were as they existed now. I am not really interested in debating what happened yesterday. I do not think the America public is very much interested in that. But I will simply take 1 minute to note that in spite of everything said by the gentleman from Louisiana, in 19 of the past 20 years, that terrible Democratic controlled Congress appropriated less dollars than we were asked to appropriate by Presidents of either party; we spent some \$20 billion less than the Presidents asked us to; we never had a deficit larger than \$74 billion until the Reagan budget passed in 1981, then it exploded to over \$300 billion.

If it were not for the additional debt above that level, which was accumulated in the 1980's with the passage of the Reagan budgets, our budgets would be balanced today and everyone knows that if they have studied the situation.

The issue is not yesterday, it is what are we going to do about today. Of course, this is going to have to be waived. I understand that. But the fact is that we face the prospect of having at least four major appropriations bills vetoed unless we have a different mindset coming from that side of the aisle.

If the Republicans want to see these appropriations bills passed, they must reach bipartisan accommodation with people who do not share every opinion that they think is inviolate. They have to recognize that in a democracy it is essential to make concessions, at least over small things, in order to get people with differing views together.

We are supposed to find common ground. We are not supposed to do what they did last night, when, after their own committee leadership tried to put together a bipartisan compromise, they walked away from it. Now, I do not know what the reasons were, but when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] worked yesterday trying to reach a bipartisan accommodation, the hard-heads in their caucus said, "No, they did not want it".

That is the kind of conduct the country has come to expect from the Republicans, but it is not the kind of conduct we can afford if these appropriation bills are going to pass, if they are going

to be signed, and if we are going to wind up not having a repeat of the disgraceful performance of last year when the Government was shut down twice.

So I would simply urge Members to quit shouting like they were attending a high school cheerleading session, grow up, recognize their responsibility, try to work in a bipartisan way and get those bills passed; and to the gentleman from Arizona—every time somebody says something you don't like, you open your mouth and you start shouting from your seat. . . .

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it within this Member's domain to ask those words to be taken down? It is a personal attack and grossly unfair, and I would ask that those words be taken down in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona demand that the words be taken down?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the sanctity of this House, I demand those words be taken down.

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

□ 1915

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I guess my question goes to the matter of what are the House precedents as far as a Member who is speaking and when there are Members in the Chamber who are acting disrespectful towards that Member? What is the proper procedure for a Member to take?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentleman to suspend until a ruling is made on the words taken down. Then the Chair will address the gentleman's question.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] rise?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the Chair will admonish Members not to interrupt Members who are speaking, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last sentence.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope I do not have to object. I hope that this interlude has calmed down some of the heat that has been on the floor, and I remind Members that if we can get through this, maybe we can finish our business tonight. I rise under my reservation to find out if the gentleman intends to apologize to the gentleman from Arizona?

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would, as I have informed the Speaker, I would be very happy to apologize to the gentleman for calling him impolite, if the gentleman would have apologized to me for interrupting me while I was speaking. He declined to do that.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

And to the gentleman from Arizona, every time somebody says something you don't like, you open your mouth and you start shouting from your seat. You are one of the most impolite Members I have ever seen in my service in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the last sentence of the gentleman from Wisconsin constitutes a personality in violation of clause 1 of rule XIV.

Without objection, the last sentence uttered will be stricken from the RECORD. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed in order.

Mr. DELAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask once again of the gentleman that in order to bring comity to this floor, and this is a very serious matter and we all understand how serious this matter is, normally under the precedents of the House, if a gentleman's words have been found to be out of order, of the regular order of this House and the Chair has ruled that the gentleman's words were out of order, under comity of the House the gentleman should apologize.

□ 1930

Under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that apology.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would be very happy to apologize to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for calling him impolite if he would apologize for being impolite to me.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, what are the actions that a Member who has the floor and is speaking on the floor, and other Members speak up to interrupt him repeatedly, and the Chair takes no action against those Members speaking; what actions can the Member who has the floor then take under the ruling? Absolutely none; I will answer the question under the ruling; so, therefore, we can do the same thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If a point of order is made, the Chair would rule on it, and the Chair did rule on it, and the Chair has tried to maintain decorum and comity throughout for those Members who were in the Chamber.

During the debate of this resolution comity has been maintained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

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

The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) because I think the gentleman did make a noble effort throughout, and the many times that he has held the Chair he has made a noble effort in trying to maintain comity on the floor.

But there is a serious question at hand here, and my question is this: that if a Member is speaking on the floor, and another Member is acting in a way that is disruptive—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut is making a statement.

Mr. GEJDENSON. The parliamentary inquiry is: What actions can the House take against an individual, what are the parliamentary avenues available to a speaker when an individual, either verbally or through motions, is disrupting his time in speaking on the floor; because, Mr. Speaker, where we find ourselves is in the situation that when an individual tries to take his time on the floor there is often conversation. But this went beyond conversation, and I just need to know for future parliamentary situations what avenues an individual ought to take if a Member is sitting in the first row trying to, by motions or statements, disrupt the speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take the initiative to maintain order in the Chamber when Members are speaking.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So, it is my conclusion then that the proper course would be to stop speaking; that would not shorten one's time; and then ask the Chair to establish order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would enlist the assistance of all Members in maintaining the spirit of mutual courtesy and comity that properly dignifies the proceedings of the House. Members who are under recognition should not be disrupted by other Members.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in this case would it not be appropriate for the Chair to rule to invoke paragraph 365, or in similar instances of Jefferson's Manual, in which it is stated:

Nevertheless if a Member finds that it is not the inclination of the House to hear him

and that by conversation or any other noise they endeavor to drown his voice, it is his most prudent way to submit to the pleasure of the House and sit down, for it scarcely ever happens that they are guilty of this piece of ill manners without sufficient reason or inattention to a Member who says anything worth their hearing.

Would that not apply in this particular instance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not rule on that.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to speak out of order.)

APOLOGIES SUGGESTED

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was seated with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] when this incident occurred, and there was provocation. A high-spirited gentleman from Arizona gets caught up in the heat of the moment, and believe me there was heat. On the other hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is essential if we are going to do the transportation bill this evening. He is the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. Both are reluctant to apologize to each other. I would.

Please. I would suggest that both gentlemen, both gentlemen, express regret that this incident happened, and then we can get on with the business of the evening.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYWORTH was allowed to speak out of order.)

CALLING FOR APOLOGY AND RESUMPTION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, because I have the utmost respect for my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], although I might have a slightly different interpretation of the events as he portrayed them in front of this body, and because I realize that there is a schedule to be kept and that Members have many obligations, and taking into account the sensitivities of some other Members, I would be happy to say now that I am certainly prepared to move ahead this evening, and to those who misinterpret my actions as somehow being disrespectful, when, in fact, of course, we have the utmost of respect for differences of opinion, and differences in styles of speaking, and different personalities, and different points of view in this Chamber, I would say that I regret the interpretation of the incident.

I still lament the words of my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I would hope he would apologize for those words and that we can move along to complete the people's business in this House, for the people's business should supersede any personalities, personal ambitions, or personal affronts.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

APOLOGIES

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say that, like the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I regret the incident that just occurred, and I will take the gentleman's comments as an apology.

I would likewise extend an apology to the gentleman for the comments which he found troublesome.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] be allowed to proceed in regular order.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 3 minutes remaining on the debate on the rule, and the gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us House Resolution 465. We next week will be able to reflect together with our constituents on how to move forward in the perfection, the implementation of the principles put forth by our Founding Fathers over 200 years ago that form the basis of our limited representative government, and we are ready this evening to get to work on another appropriations bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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 248, nays 166, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No 286]

YEAS—248

Allard	Bryant (TN)	Deal
Archer	Bunn	DeFazio
Armey	Bunning	DeLay
Bachus	Burr	Diaz-Balart
Baesler	Burton	Dickey
Baker (CA)	Buyer	Dooley
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Doolittle
Ballenger	Calvert	Dornan
Barr	Camp	Doyle
Barrett (NE)	Campbell	Dreier
Barrett (WI)	Canady	Duncan
Bartlett	Castle	Dunn
Barton	Chabot	Durbin
Bass	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bateman	Chenoweth	English
Bellenson	Christensen	Ensign
Bereuter	Chrysler	Everett
Berman	Clinger	Ewing
Bevill	Coble	Fawell
Bilbray	Coburn	Fields (TX)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Flanagan
Bliley	Combest	Foley
Blute	Cooley	Forbes
Boehlert	Cox	Fowler
Boehner	Crane	Fox
Bonilla	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Bono	Cremeans	Franks (NJ)
Boucher	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Brownback	Cunningham	Frisa

Funderburk	LaTourette	Rogers
Gallegly	Laughlin	Rohrabacher
Ganske	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Gekas	Leach	Roth
Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)	Roukema
Gillmor	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Gilman	Lightfoot	Salmon
Goodlatte	Linder	Sanford
Goodling	Lipinski	Saxton
Gordon	Livingston	Scarborough
Goss	LoBiondo	Schaefer
Graham	Longley	Schiff
Greene (UT)	Lucas	Seastrand
Gunderson	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Gutierrez	Martini	Shadegg
Gutknecht	McCollum	Shaw
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Shays
Hancock	McHugh	Shuster
Hansen	McInnis	Sisisky
Hastert	McIntosh	Skeen
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Hayes	Metcalf	Smith (NJ)
Hayworth	Meyers	Smith (WA)
Hefley	Mica	Solomon
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Souder
Herger	Molinari	Spence
Hilleary	Montgomery	Stearns
Hobson	Moorhead	Stump
Hoekstra	Morella	Talent
Hoke	Murtha	Tate
Horn	Myers	Tauzin
Hostettler	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Houghton	Nethercutt	Thomas
Hunter	Neumann	Thornberry
Hutchinson	Ney	Tiahrt
Hyde	Norwood	Torkildsen
Inglis	Nussle	Traficant
Istook	Obey	Upton
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Vucanovich
Johnson, Sam	Parker	Walker
Jones	Paxon	Walsh
Kaptur	Petri	Wamp
Kasich	Pickett	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Pombo	Weldon (FL)
Kim	Porter	Weller
King	Portman	White
Kingston	Pryce	Wicker
Klecza	Quillen	Wilson
Klug	Quinn	Wolf
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Kolbe	Ramstad	Young (FL)
LaHood	Regula	Zeliff
Largent	Riggs	Zimmer
Latham	Roberts	

NAYS—166

Abercrombie	Farr	Maloney
Andrews	Fattah	Manton
Baldacci	Fazio	Markey
Barcia	Fields (LA)	Martinez
Becerra	Filner	Mascara
Bentsen	Foglietta	Matsui
Bishop	Ford	McCarthy
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Bonior	Frost	McHale
Borski	Furse	McKinney
Browder	Gejdenson	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Geren	Meek
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Menendez
Bryant (TX)	Green (TX)	Millender-
Cardin	Hamilton	McDonald
Chapman	Harman	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Clayton	Hefner	Mink
Clement	Hilliard	Moakley
Clyburn	Hinchey	Mollohan
Coleman	Holden	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hoyer	Nadler
Collins (MI)	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Condit	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Conyers	(TX)	Olver
Costello	Jefferson	Ortiz
Coyne	Johnson (SD)	Orton
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Cummings	Johnston	Pallone
Danner	Kanjorski	Pastor
de la Garza	Kennedy (MA)	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Kennedy (RI)	Payne (VA)
Dellums	Kennelly	Pelosi
Deutsch	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Klink	Pomeroy
Dingell	LaFalce	Poshard
Dixon	Lantos	Rahall
Doggett	Levin	Rangel
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Reed
Engel	Lofgren	Richardson
Eshoo	Lowey	Rivers
Evans	Luther	Roemer

Rose	Spratt	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Stark	Vento
Rush	Stenholm	Visclosky
Sabo	Stokes	Volkmer
Sanders	Studds	Ward
Sawyer	Stupak	Waters
Schroeder	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Schumer	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Scott	Tejeda	Williams
Serrano	Thompson	Wise
Skaggs	Thornton	Woolsey
Skelton	Thurman	Wynn
Slaughter	Torres	Yates

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Stockman
Brewster	Jacobs	Torricelli
Davis	Lincoln	Towns
Ehrlich	McDade	Weldon (PA)
Flake	Oxley	Whitfield
Gibbons	Peterson (FL)	
Greenwood	Smith (TX)	

□ 1959

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1996, OR FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1996, TO MONDAY, JULY 8, 1996, AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1996, FRIDAY JUNE 28, 1996, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1996, OR SUNDAY, JUNE 30, 1996, TO MONDAY, JULY 8, 1996.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Pursuant to House Resolution 465, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 192

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative days of Thursday, June 27, 1996, or Friday, June 28, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Monday, July 8, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 27, 1996, Friday, June 28, 1996, Saturday, June 29, 1996, or Sunday, June 30, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 8, 1996, or until such time of that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—INSTRUCTING COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO IMMEDIATELY TRANSMIT REMAINING CHARGES AGAINST SPEAKER GINGRICH TO OUTSIDE COUNSEL

Mr. SAM JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 468) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 468

Whereas the Constitution of the United States places upon the House of Representatives the responsibility to regulate the conduct of its own Members:

Whereas the House has delegated that responsibility, in part, to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which is charged with investigating alleged violations of any law, rule, regulation or other standard of conduct by a Member of the House;

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House;

Whereas, although an outside counsel has been appointed to investigate the Speaker, the Committee has failed to allow that outside counsel to investigate serious charges concerning the Speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, and its relationship to several tax-exempt organizations;

Whereas a formal complaint concerning these charges has been languishing before the Committee for more than six months;

Whereas new evidence of violations of federal tax law—in addition to the information contained in the formal complaint—has also been recently reported by investigative journalists around the country;

Whereas the failure to take action on these matters has raised serious questions about the impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is hereby instructed to immediately transmit the remaining charges against Speaker Gingrich to the outside counsel for his investigation and recommendations.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 170, answered "present" 9, not voting 25, as follows: