rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. 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 299, nays 84, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 782]

YEAS—299

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torres
Upton
Vento
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Wicker
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—84

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Barcia
Becerra
Bishop
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Costello
Crane
Durbin
Ensign
Everett
Fazio
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (RI)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Longley
Maloney
Markey
McDermott
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Neal
Oberstar
Orton
Payne (NJ)
Pombo
Poshard
Rush
Sabo
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Stenholm
Stockman
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Traficant
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Harman

NOT VOTING—48

Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Blute
Borski
Boucher
Buyer
Cardin
Cox
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Farr
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Frank (MA)
Johnston
Kaptur
Klug
LaFalce
Lewis (CA)
Martinez
McHugh
Mfume
Nadler
Owens
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Quillen
Radanovich
Richardson
Riggs
Rose
Shuster
Stark
Studds
Tejeda
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Volkmer
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Williams
Wilson
Young (AK)

□ 0952

Mr. WAMP changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], if he could indicate to our colleagues what we are about to engage in today. Members are seeking leadership.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield, I am happy to inform my friend that we are about to embark on debate on the rule for the continuing resolution, and we hope that we can move quickly through that, have a vote, and then proceed with the continuing resolution. Then we will proceed with the rule on the debt-ceiling increase, move through that quickly, and then have a vote.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Does the gentleman assume these efforts will be to send directly to the President the product of the Senate, or are we going to conference on these matters?

Mr. DREIER. I am not in a position to answer that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Is there anyone on the gentleman's side who could tell us? We just simply, for purposes of Members' schedules, wanted to know whether we were going to try to send to the President the product of today's efforts, or whether we are simply going back to conference on these matters.

Mr. DREIER. To whom would my friend like to yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be more than happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. To whom would he like to yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be more than happy to yield to anyone who could tell us.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] perhaps?

Mr. DREIER. I do not know if he is on the floor. That was the schedule we have right now. I know there are Members anxious to get home for this very important local day. If we could proceed with consideration of this rule, we will get started.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We will be more than happy to proceed.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield further, I have just been informed here that we are going to be doing the rules back to back, and then we will take up the continuing resolution on the debt ceiling, following consideration of both.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Would it be possible for the leadership to inform us after the two rules are dealt with as to what the intention of the majority is?

Mr. DREIER. We will look forward to the gentleman's inquiry at that time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We look forward to the gentleman's response.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with any Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of all Senate amendments. Any Senate amendments and motions shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except any such demand made by the majority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House, without intervening point of order, of a motion if offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 115, a continuing resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 through December 1, 1995.

This rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees, and further provides that the previous question is ordered to adoption of the motion without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question unless the demand is made by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, a short-term continuing resolution is necessary to continue Government operations while we complete the appropriations bills that will put the Federal Government on the 7-year path to a balanced budget. As the Chairman of the Federal Reserve recently said, this effort to come to grips with our chronic and unsustainable Federal deficits is truly extraordinary. It will result in tangible benefits for every American family in the coming years.

While the protectors of big government continue to hold hope deep in their hearts that we will fail, they will be disappointed. It is simply not acceptable for this Congress to fail as our predecessors have. We will not mortgage the future of our children with trillions of dollars of debt.

We will also not apologize for taking time to balance the budget. Past Congresses relied on continuing resolutions on many occasions. There is no question of competence. Instead, ask what Congress is doing with the time a continuing resolution provides. When those on the other side of the aisle controlled this House, they needed time to find enough ways to spend this country $5 trillion into the hole.

Be assured, if we didn't care about the future of this country, and we agreed with the President's proposition that we just spend enough to avoid tough decisions, we wouldn't need extra time.

Mr. Speaker, the single most important aspect of this continuing resolution is that it is fiscally sound. Funding is lower than the current continuing resolution and below fiscal year 1995. It creates the proper environment to negotiate the outstanding appropriations bills. While disposing of the amendments with the Senate is important, the overriding issue to get this continuing resolution in place by next Monday so that the stage is set to complete our historic budget work.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep our eyes set on our ultimate goals. We will balance the Federal budget, save the Medicare system for a generation of retirees, end welfare as we know it, and implement a tax cut for families that increases the take-home-pay of American workers.

This rule will permit the House to resolve the remaining differences on this continuing resolution so that next week we can get back to accomplishing those critical goals. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1000

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding the customary half-hour of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, our lack of opposition to the rule is in no way any lack of indication of our strong and strenuous opposition to the continuing resolution it would make it order.

We support the rule because we believe that passing it is the responsible thing to do. We should move decisively now to set the stage for eventually passing a simple, clean bill, with no extraneous provisions or certainly no controversial ones, that continues Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, we should not even be debating this rule this morning. This is a beginning of Veterans Day weekend. We should be in our districts observing this important occasion. I am sure most of us assumed we would be and have commitments, in fact, to do. But the Republican-controlled Congress has been unable to do its most basic job: passing appropriations bills. This is the only reason we are here considering this resolution under these unusual circumstances and not back home where we all planned to be.

This continuing resolution replaces 11 regular appropriations bills, which by all standards should have been sent to the President for his signature by now. The fact is that most of those yet to be approved have been delayed because of nongermane, extraneous, irrelevant legislative provisions that the majority allowed to be included in appropriations bills, despite the fact they had to waive our rules to do so.

Mr. Speaker, our rules prohibit legislation, policy matters, in appropriations bills for a good reason. We know it is difficult to avoid doing that entirely, but the provisions we are discussing today are major and very controversial. They are, in fact, causing intractable disagreements between Republican Members of the other body, and Republican Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be doing today what we could have done earlier this week: voting on a continuing appropriations measure that is a clean, straightforward extension of funding for the Government until the remaining 11 regular appropriations bills are passed and signed into law, so that our Government can continue to function.

Unfortunately, we will again be denied that opportunity and the Government will no doubt be unnecessarily shut down on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are willing and ready to expedite the business of this House. We oppose this continuing resolution that has been burdened by the Republican leadership with extraneous and controversial provisions, including restriction on the right of nonprofit groups that accept any Federal money to engage in political advocacy, even with their own funds. That language, no matter how much the other body tried to soften it, has no business being included in this resolution. It should be voted on separately in the normal course of legislative business like any other legislative proposal.

The Republican leadership is obviously keeping this most controversial provision in a simple bill to mollify and placate a minority in the House, but what we need now is leadership and political courage. This action, the action that we are being asked to take today, is unworthy of the Republican leadership and calculated to prevent the bill from being signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the President will not accept the Istook language and the other extraneous provisions that do not belong in the bill.

The White House has made that quite clear.

What we are doing today is unduly extending a process that can and should be expedited. We should not be including the provision affecting the Medicare part B premium increase in the bill. That is a matter being addressed in the budget reconciliation bill, and that is where this provision making permanent changes in law belongs.

Mr. Speaker, it is totally irresponsible to be playing these political games that threaten a costly shutdown of the Government. If the majority is seriously interested in preventing this action, and in doing that in the most expeditious manner possible, it will reconsider its decision to bring this encumbered legislation to the floor again.

We should, as I said, be voting on a clean, unencumbered, straightforward continuing resolution. If one were before us, it would pass easily. We Democrats have made it clear that we would vote for it; we are confident a great many Republicans would also do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only action that will give our Committee on Appropriations members time to resolve with the Senate and with the President most, if not all, of the remaining differences that they have on the remaining appropriations bills.

We could be doing that today if the majority really wanted to get down to attending to the Nation's business. The country is waiting for some political leadership and for us to end these types of political games.

Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to do the right thing: To reject the continuing resolution this rule makes in order, so that we can instead act seriously and responsibly. Then, and only then, will we be carrying out our duty to govern this Nation.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, so that we can move ahead as expeditiously as possible, at this time we have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is one of the most ridiculous, unnecessary, partisan games I've seen in all my years in Congress. The sole purpose of a continuing resolution is to keep the Government running while Congress works to pass the appropriations bills. A continuing resolution should not be used to further a political agenda. A continuing resolution should not be used to blackmail the President. A continuing resolution should not be trifled with.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution should be clean and bipartisan, plain and simple.

But this continuing resolution is not, it is full of Republican extras that have no place on a bill as serious as this one.

It is the duty of the majority party to govern, and sometimes that means putting aside political games. And sometimes that means putting the interests of the American people before anything else.

I urge my colleagues defeat this rule.

Come back with a clean continuing resolution so that we can get back to the business of governing this country. That is what we were sent here to do.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], who is managing the rule on our side. Is it not true that the Republicans in the Senate and the House have stubbornly refused to drop the increase in the part B premium on Medicare, so that that will be established at 31 percent rather than being permitted to drop to 25 percent as in current law?

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

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am afraid what the gentleman has said is quite true.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if what this means, of course, is that senior citizens, instead of next year paying $42 a month for their part B, will pay $53 a month for their part B, an increase of $11 per month, and this is on a glidepath that the Republicans are following that will take part B, premiums to $87 a month by the year 2002, instead of $60 a month as in current law, which means that senior citizens will be paying $27 more per month if we follow this strategy to its conclusion?

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman again is quite correct.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, these increases in Medicare part B are totally unnecessary. The increases are being used to go to the general fund, not to provide for the solvency of Medicare, and are being used to fund the tax cut being proposed by the other side.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would again say that I know my colleagues would like to get back to their districts so that they can deal with the pressing needs of Veterans Day ceremonies. For that reason, I reserve the balance of my time, and hope that we can expeditiously move ahead here.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from California, if he and his friends over there cared that much about getting us home on time on Veterans Day, there are ways of doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here today in this session, in this House, in this city, is because of the failure of the Republican leadership to pass appropriation bills on time.

Mr. Speaker, now they come to us with a continuing resolution to keep government in business, but they add a kicker. They will not allow the Federal Government to stay in business unless we agree to raise Medicare premiums on the elderly by 25 percent.

Speaker GINGRICH is determined to raise Medicare premiums to cut the Medicare program. That is his agenda. He has said to the President of the United States, ''We will not allow Government to stay in business, unless you will raise Medicare premiums.''

Mr. Speaker, we are counting on the President of the United States to veto this bill; to stand up for American families and America seniors. We can go ahead today and defeat the rule. We can defeat this CR, but the final judgment will come in the White House when the President is forced to veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope at that point that Speaker GINGRICH will ease up on the elderly of this country and move forward to a bipartisan approach.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in honor of America's veterans and those Members who hope to participate in ceremonies in their districts, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Members are impatient to get out of here, but pardon me, there is the public's business to be done. I do not make any apology whatsoever for taking a couple of minutes to talk about that public business.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is happening today is truly sad, and I think it is an example of why this Congress is held in such low esteem by the general public.

In November, I think the American people put the Republican Party in charge of both the House and the Senate because they honestly thought that that would force both parties to get over their ideological and political hangups and maneuvering and it would force both parties to work together for the good of the people we are supposed to be representing.

Mr. Speaker, instead, I think on a bill such as this they are getting more maneuvering, more political posturing, and more business as usual.

Today is Veterans Day. I had intended to be in my district today at three separate veterans celebrations and one additional one tomorrow. Obviously, I am not going to get there under these circumstances. My planes have already left.

□ 1015

We are supposed to be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. The veterans who fought in World War II did not have the luxury of playing political games. They did not have the luxury of cynical maneuvering. They simply had to plow ahead and do their job. I wish that we were following their example today. But unfortunately, we are not. In fact, we can go home and give all of the speeches we want to veterans telling them how much we care about them, but in fact the reality of this maneuver today is simply going to be that what we are going to be saying to every single veteran of World War II is: ''Guess what, I have got a Veterans Day present for you, we are going to raise your Medicare part B premium on the order of between 11 and 13 bucks,'' depending upon whose numbers you listen to today.

So I guess it is kind of fitting that most Members of Congress will not be able to be home with their veterans today, because I think we ought to have a better message to give them than that.

Now, what this budget, what the budget does that is being pushed through the Congress is to cut education. It is going to cut health for kids. The idea behind it is that we are telling people to rely more on charities. But then what this vehicle proposes to do with the Istook amendment today is to say: Oh, by the way, we are giving these charities much more to do because Government is bugging out on its concerns for children and its concerns for the poor, but by the way, we are going to shut things off so that these charities cannot lobby Congress and tell us what they think about those changes.

We know that the President will not sign this legislation. We know that the only result of what we are doing today is that the Government is going to shut down come Monday.

I would like to make one point and compare the way we proceeded last year with the way we are proceeding this year. Last year, when I chaired the Committee on Appropriations, every single appropriation bill was finished by the end of the fiscal year. That happened for one very simple reason, because when I took over as chairman, the very first thing I did was to go to the senior Republican on the committee and say: ''Look, let us bridge our partisan differences and work out a bipartisan allocation of dollars among the 13 appropriation bills.''

That is what we did. We worked it out in a bipartisan way, in a conciliatory way, and we passed all 13 of those bills for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

This time around my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in this session, has not been given the opportunity to do that. Instead, it is pretty apparent to me he has got his marching orders and the marching orders are very clear: ''Load up these appropriation bills with as many partisan gimmicks as you can, create as much confrontation as you can, divide people as much as you can.'' And after those instructions have gone out, is it any wonder that Congress has not been able to finish its work?

This chart demonstrates that it has not been a Presidential failure of leadership which has resulted in this budget impasse. It has been a congressional failure of leadership. We have so far these three bills down to the White House. They have crossed the finish line. We have nine bills remaining that have a long way to do before they even get to the White House. The Labor–HHS bill passed by the House was in such an extreme form that the Republican-controlled Senate will not even take it up. Four other appropriation bills are tied up on the issue of abortion, a nonbudget item. Others are tied up because of extremist language that was attached on the environmental and several others are tied up because of money differences.

The fact is that 89 percent of the appropriations business that this Congress has to do is still not done. And that is not because of the failure of the President to provide leadership but because of the failure of this Congress to bridge partisan differences and philosophical differences and do what is necessary to compromise in the interest of the people we represent.

That is why this rule is a fool's mission. This rule is going to produce a product which is going nowhere. We will all be back here Monday, after we have gone home and preached our psalms, we will come back Monday to pick up and clean up the damage done by the passage of this legislation today, because this will never become law. All it will do is increase the risk—and decrease the time necessary to avoid the risk—of blowing up this process with innocent people getting hit by the shrapnel.

That is all that is happening today. I speak with a great deal of regret because it seems to me that the job of Congress, instead of attaching the Istook amendment, which we know will simply bottle this legislation up, instead of insisting that we raise the Medicare part B premium, we ought to have a simple 1-month clean extension so we have some time to do our real work rather than the nonsense and posturing that is going on today represented by this joke of a bill and this joke of a rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say, in light of the fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no experience whatsoever in dealing with appropriations bills that will move us in the direction of a balanced budget, it seems to me that it is quite apparent that they are blocking our attempts to move toward a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA], who has worked long and hard in his very short 4-year period of time to get us to this point of a balanced budget, unlike our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have served for years and years and years and controlled this place and have not done anything whatsoever to help us balance the Federal budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to contain myself when I hear the accusations from the other side. Again, we hear the Mediscare threats that are made by the other side. It really galls me because they do not want to deal with the facts. If all else fails, I always say on the floor, read the bill. The bill in fact says that any savings in our proposal go into the Medicare trust fund. It is a simple fact. But they want to insist on scaring the seniors of this country.

And then they talk about veterans. What a shame, what a scam that here just before the eve of Veterans Day that in fact this side that has developed programs and plans that give better benefits, better benefits to illegal aliens and people who will not work in this country than they do to our veterans and our senior citizens.

This is a shame on the eve of that occasion.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, out of deference to those who want to get home to their districts to attend veterans' ceremonies, I reserve the balance of my time and hope that we can move ahead as expeditiously as possible, simply pass this rule, and Members can vote against the continuing resolution if they so choose when we begin debate on that.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

First of all, the gentleman from Florida protests too much; $300 million in cuts in veterans benefits.

Last year we cut 40 programs. We have downsized, cut 400 of them, reduced their spending. This Congress has been about the business of reducing in the last Congress a trillion dollars in debt.

The fact of the matter is this is not serious business that we are about today. This is fiscally and personally irresponsible. There is not one on the other side of the aisle that does not know that this bill is dead, dead, dead. The President has said he is going to veto it.

I have served in this body since 1981. Almost every year that side of the aisle has strongly from all of the microphones in all of the committees urged this body, if it was going to pass a CR, a funding bill to keep Government going while the political disputes on this Hill continue, has strongly urged a clean CR. Democrats, do not lard it up. Do not force Reagan and Bush to sign

something. Make it clean. In fact the Committee on Appropriations, for the large part, supported that effort and did that.

The fact of the matter is, until they took control, until their extremist agenda could not see the light of day in this House, they cannot pass bills. So what they want to do is put it in a continuing resolution and say, if you do not do it my way, then shut down the Government and put at risk the credit of the United States of America.

As I said, that is fiscally irresponsible. It is personally irresponsible. It is far, far less than the American public expects of this body and of each of us. Vote no on this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that, if this balanced budget CR is dead, dead, dead at the White House, it is for the reason that the White House opposes, opposes, opposes a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so that Members can get home to their veterans.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would reserve the balance of his time and stop yielding a few seconds every now and then to himself.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly I am pleased that there is a new interest in honoring our veterans. If we really want to honor our veterans, do not force this country into default and lead to the cancellation and delay of services that our veterans need. If we really want to honor our veterans, do not raise their Medicare premiums. Do not cut the Medicare that over 8 million veterans in this country are eligible for. That is a way to honor our veterans.

How is it that we got ourselves as Americans into this mess where we stand on the brink of default for the first time in the history of the United States? Well, it happened for a number of reasons.

The first one was that our Republican colleagues wasted month after month trying to impose a contract on America that they told us was the greatest thing that had come along since sliced bread. Then in this morning's paper, we learn the truth, indeed the fiction behind that great contract on America.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, a Gingrich protege, never really measured the contract's popularity in the first place. Luntz announced that he tested only ad campaign slogans supporting the contract. The House Republicans' legislative agenda is not losing popularity. It is probably just shutting popularity it never had in the first place.

The same story goes to quote the great pollster that backed up all this contract on America on which time was wasted instead of getting on with the real business of the American people as saying that the purpose of this polling had been to find the most persuasive wording of the contract's proposition for preelection ads in TV Guide.

You see, when you run Government by bumper sticker instead of Government by involving the people, by good sense, by attending to the real needs of the American people, you end up on the brink that we face today of default.

The second way they did it is through the appropriations process. Speaker after speaker has noted that they simply did not do their work. We were not supposed to be here in the middle of November dealing with appropriations bills. They were all due months ago. When we reached the deadline, 2 of 13 appropriations bills had been passed by the Republican majority and signed by the President of the United States. Why did they not get the work done? They had a little time after they wasted months with the contract on America. Well, we know why they were unable to complete their work, because the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations himself declared in committee, and I quote, it is payback time.

Yes, America, it is payback time, not to the ordinary people of America but those various extremist groups that dominate the Republican Party selection process. They deserve their due.

Well, we ended up, therefore, honoring our veterans instead of by appropriating the moneys for our national security, that bill has not been forwarded to the President's desk. It has been tied up. Finally, by contracting to the lobby the job of governing America, the Gingrichites have pursued error with excellence.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I would be using 15 seconds or so each time to respond to the rhetoric that we have been listening to from the other side of the aisle. But I have come to the conclusion that we are going to have to bring out our big guns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1030

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would feel much better if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] would use the Republican side so people in the audience do not get mistaken on who is saying what.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], one of the things I am most proud about in life is that many years ago Ronald Reagan and I saw the light. I was a John F. Kennedy, I was a Harry Truman, Democrat, and my party deserted my beliefs, and I became a Republican, and I am proud of it.

Now let me just say this: My colleagues, I do not know about the previous speaker and whether or not he is a veteran, but I am going to say something, my colleagues. I am a Marine Corps veteran, and I am proud of that, too, and I am going to tell my colleagues something.

I see the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] sitting back there, and there are two Members in this House that, I guess, have a reputation that we are so proud of because he and I, and I used to be the ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but he and I stood up for these veterans, we developed a reputation, he probably even more than I, as being the two Members of Congress that really stood up; so I think when I stand up here today I am going to speak for the veterans of this Nation, I am going to speak for the older veterans of this Nation that some have referred to, older ones like me that are 65 years old and on Medicare, and I am going to tell my colleagues we are determined that we are going to save Medicare. It is not going to go bankrupt, and we are going to pursue it right to the end, and we will succeed. We will save it for the people of this country and for my children and my grandchildren.

Now, as my colleagues know, I have been keeping track, and I am going to try to keep my emotions down, which I have a problem sometimes doing, but I have kept track of all the speakers on this side of the aisle, which is why I came over here to speak over here, and every one of them, just about, appear on this list. This is the National Taxpayers' Union list of big spenders.

Now what is ironic about that? As my colleagues know, we had the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] up here with his chart, and I do not have a chart, but let me just make one.

Here is a great big pie; OK? I wish everybody could see this. Talk in the mike? OK. It will not reach. I cannot get it over here.

Let me just show my colleagues what is on the pie. This pie is $1½ trillion. I am getting help from my New York colleagues here. This pie represents the Federal budget, $1½ trillion. And do my colleagues know of that budget there is a little set-aside there which requires $250 billion just to pay the interest on the accrued national debt that now has reached $5 trillion. Yes, we are paying $250 billion to the holders of that $5 trillion debt.

Who are the holders of that debt? Most of it is held by foreign countries, by the Netherlands, by Great Britain, and then we have holders in this country. I own some of these Treasury notes myself. But let me tell my colleagues what happens.

President Clinton gave us a budget last year, and I have got that chart over there someplace, but I will not bother to drag it out here now, but he wanted to increase that national debt, accumulated national debt, from $5 trillion up to $6 trillion.

Now then what happens to the amount of interest that we have to pay on that debt if we had let that go through? Instead of just $250 billion, it would have grown to $350 billion, and

another $100 billion would have been taken out of those available funds to pay for help for the truly needy, the people that really need the help.

Do my colleagues know what happens when we pursue this kind of irresponsible spending? Then interest rates go up, and inflation goes up.

Do my colleagues recall 1979 when Jimmy Carter was President? Interest rates rose to 23½ percent prime, which means businessmen like me at the time had to pay 26½ percent. Inflation went up from 4 percent all the way up to 13 percent. If that ever happened now with this kind of irresponsible spending, we would not have this kind of irresponsible spending, we would not have just a debt interest of $250 billion or $350 billion. It would go up to almost $500 billion, and each time it raises from $10, to $20, to $50 billion, that means another $10, or $20, or $50 billion that is there less, the funds that are there, for the truly needy.

So let me tell my colleagues something, Mr. Speaker. What is compassionate? What is compassionate for my children, and my grandchildren, and all of my colleagues', and all of those out there, is to bite the bullet and be fiscally responsible. That is exactly what we have been doing with these budgets. We are determined that we are going to bring this budget under balance.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply inquire of my friend who has served in this place for 17 years how many balanced budgets our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have fought for the way we are fighting for a balanced budget today, and I would be——

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say zero, and I would say this. When we took over, the gentleman and I took over the Committee on Rules this year, what was the first thing we did? We told the Republican Party, ''You have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on this floor.'' We said to the Democratic Party, ''You have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on the floor of this Congress.'' We wrote to the President of the United States, and never got an answer, and we said, ''Mr. President, you have no choice but to offer a balanced budget on the floor of this Congress.''

What did that do? That meant that anybody's alternative had to be balanced because that was the most serious problem facing this Nation, and that is what we got. We are going to pursue the balanced budget.

Now I have just been passed a little note——

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate it now that we are talking about balanced budgets. I want to be sure that the gentleman is aware that during the 12 years of Reagan and Bush they sent budgets over here that in 11 of those 12 years had to be cut by this Congress, which seems to be a little different history than the gentleman is offering to the public here.

The other point I wanted to make or question I wanted to ask the gentleman was this:

The gentleman says that we have a great need to balance the budget which means we cannot spend too much, we have got to have that money to pay our debt. In that case why does the gentleman have a $245 billion tax cut in his budget mostly for rich people?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman why we do. Because a capital gains tax cut means so much to the farmers that I represent in upstate New York. Let me tell the gentleman——

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman here in 1981——

Mr. SOLOMON. Do not interrupt, my friend. Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt my colleague. Let me tell my colleague what a $500 tax cut does to the people who are making $21,000 or $22,000 or $30,000 or even $40,000. They are trying to salvage enough money for a downpayment on a home and then be able to meet the mortgage payment on that home. Let me tell my colleague they are better off having the money in their pocket instead of the gentleman's pocket in the Congress to go and spend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague, ''We ain't going to do it anymore. We're going to balance the budget.''

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], if he was a Republican in the past as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] was a Democrat in the past.

I say to the gentleman, ''We're happy to have you, CHARLIE.''

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I came to this side of the aisle because it is going to be difficult to distinguish me from my dear friend and colleague. We are both 65. We are both combat veterans. We both come from the great State of New York. We both love our country. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we both seek a balanced budget. The only difference I think we have is how we achieve that. Our veterans association kind of thinks that my buddy from upstate New York is wrong in how he wants to achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, those that fought and were in the dugouts trying to preserve this great Nation somehow do not understand today this $245 billion tax cut that we are talking about on Veterans Day. I cannot find any of the organizations, the American Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans—I really cannot find them reaching out for this capital gains tax cut that our veterans are talking about.

Now I am 65, I have more of a concern in Medicare than ever before. Right here in this resolution we are talking about increasing the premium, for my colleague and for me and for those veterans that are 65 and over. It says here, it says here, even though most Republicans would not know this because these things do not go through committee anymore, but my colleague should know it because it comes from the Speaker's office; it says here that according to CBO, part B premiums will increase under this CR from $42.50 a month under current law to $55.10.

The resolution changes current law. It sets the premiums at 31.5 percent of part B expenditures instead of the 25 percent in current law, and my colleagues say they are not changing anything. This is even higher than what did fly through without hearings by the Republicans in the Committee on Ways and Means which had jurisdiction before the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker's office thought it can be done in a different way.

To get back to the Medicare increases, there was a shrieking voice here about 10 minutes ago claiming, the gentleman from Florida, claiming that we were trying to frighten our senior citizens, meaning me and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] included, if we did not know what our colleagues were up to. We rely on those that provide the services. Being Catholic, I went to Catholic Charities, who provide for we old folks when we need help. They vigorously oppose what our colleagues are doing to Medicare. Then I went to my Jewish friends, and I went to the Jewish Council Against Poverty, who provide for old folks. They vigorously oppose this. The Protestant Council that provide for our poor and for our aged. if my colleagues find every hospital that provides nursing home for those that have been rejected by society, they oppose it.

So my friend from Florida, please go home to where the old folks are, go to the nursing homes, go to the hospitals, go to the clinics, and ask the old folks who is against them.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, maybe I should stand right in the middle, but in any case today we are talking about, and the gentleman from California, my good friend from New York, who I know it grieves him to be away from his veterans on Veterans Day, we are talking about a balanced budget. But guess what? We are not here because of a balanced budget. That is not what is holding it up. That is not why we are here. We are here for one reason. There is a sophomore Congressman from Oklahoma who has an idea that seems

outlandish even to his Republican colleagues in the Senate, and he is keeping us here today on an amendment that has nothing to do with the balanced budget. The extremists on that side of the aisle have this goofy scheme, and their leadership cannot even whip them in line.

Make no mistake about it. We are just observers, we on this side of the aisle. It is Republican versus Republican. It is those on the far right versus those on the very far right.

□ 1145

You guys and you gals cannot agree. You cannot get your act together. That is why the gentleman from New York, JERRY SOLOMON, cannot be home with his veterans today.

Mr. Speaker, I have a message to the Speaker and the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the other members of the Committee on Rules: Tell the gentleman from Oklahoma that his idea is kooky, tell him he knows that he cannot get it passed on the floor of the House alone, and he cannot get it passed on the floor of the Senate alone; he should stop all these tricks, show some leadership, get his act together, and then maybe we can debate the real issue, the balanced budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I only need 1 minute, really, to address the House, Mr. Speaker, to refute the comments from the other side.

It was not our side that said this Medicare system is going bankrupt. It was their Presidential Commission, made up of their Cabinet members. Our plan only limits the increase in spending. There are increases. But what they want to do is continue the bankrupt policy.

Read today's paper. See what Secretary Rubin has said. He said that to make this thing work, to go on spending us into debt, to continue this tax-and-spend policy, we will even rob the retirement funds, the trust funds, what little is left in them, to keep this scam going.

That is what this is about. That is what has to end. People are tired of the tax-and-spend and wasteful policy, and they want these programs in order, and our seniors demand that they be in order. The 10 percent and 13 percent increases in Medicare that have continued are crazy. What is wrong with doing away with fraud, waste, and abuse and adopting some of the other reforms we have proposed?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we did read the front page of the papers today. What we found out was that the Contract With America was based upon a phony and fraudulent poll. We did read the front pages of the paper today. What we found out is the American people do not believe you, they do not trust you, and they do not like what you are doing to them. That is what was on the front pages of the paper today.

The American people have caught on to what you are doing. They know you are not preserving and protecting Medicare. They know you are hurting the elderly in this country. They know you are hurting the children in this country. They know you are willing to put another million children into poverty. Why? So you can give a tax break to your wealthy contributors, the wealthiest people in this Nation, because that is what your plan does.

You spent 100 days in an ideological feeding frenzy around here, accomplishing nothing except slapping one another on the back and slapping the taxpayers and the poor people in this country in the face. So for 100 days you have nothing to show for it.

October came and went. We do not have the appropriations bill done. We do not have a budget done because, as the previous speaker said, this is a fight among Republicans. This was a fight among some Republicans who think we ought to govern while we are here, and other Republicans that think we ought to burn the place down, and those who want to hand them the matches. That will not work. That will not work with the American people. Every poll, every measurement of the American people are telling you, ''Don't do it.'' Do not do this to their parents, grandparents; do not do this to their parents, do not do this to their children. Give them an opportunity for an education, give them an opportunity for health care security, give them an opportunity to live the twilight of their life with dignity.

What is the gift you gave to veterans in my district, the veterans in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]? That was a promise. It was in the budget but it was taken out here. We did read the papers, and America is reading the papers. America is on to you. They are on to you. You cannot run, you cannot hide. Pass a clean budget. Pass a clean continuing resolution. Pass a clean debt limit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Garden Grove, CA [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot of references to senior citizens and to grandparents. I am a senior citizen, and I enjoy it immensely. I have a 10th grandchild on the way.

We have a blueprint before us on what we are supposed to be all about here. It is called the Preamble to the Constitution. I think at this moment, among all this frivolity and false charges about how we are trying to hurt me, and how we are trying to hurt me and my fellow grandparents, that we take a look at that beautiful blueprint to what this Constitution is all about, that we are supposed to honor in this place. We the people of the United States, in order to, and it should have a colon there, as we go into the list of things that we are supposed to do. We are supposed to be involved in an ongoing process here to form a more perfect union. Sometimes it gets a little rough, but that is what we are trying to do.

Then it says we want to establish justice. Look at court TV sometime. Look at the Menendez brothers' trial or the latest fiasco in Los Angeles. The justice system is getting a little worn here, and that is why we need a lot of reform, like the habeas corpus that was in the bill we passed yesterday over a lot of hollering and objection from the liberals in this Chamber.

Then we are supposed to ensure domestic tranquility. Have you been in some of our neighborhoods in some of our big urban areas? Not much domestic tranquility out there.

Then, to provide for the common defense. If the pyschopathic government in Iran lobs one rogue missile in our direction, or at Jerusalem or Haifa, we do not have any ability to stop it, after all the trillion dollars we put into defense just over the last decade. That is a disgrace, and it is not on this side of the aisle.

Then it says, ''Promote the general welfare.'' Go look up welfare in a 1700's dictionary, and it means the business climate, to help enhance the creation of jobs, not welfare as it is in this century.

Then, after promoting a general, healthy business climate, the creation of jobs, here comes the payoff: ''To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves,'' nothing wrong with enlightened self-interest, ''and to our posterity.'' That is my 10th grandchild, due to arrive in January; for some of you recordholders, like the gentleman from California, HENRY GONZALEZ, the gentleman from California, RON PACKARD, or the gentleman from Kentucky, 30.

Here is Clinton's budget projection for 10 years. It is a nightmare. Let us work together here, folks. We can get the job done, for posterity.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for a very simple reason. There has been gross mismanagement of this session. For no other reason.

This is a continuing resolution, to continue appropriations. Why? Because the majority has not been able to pass their appropriation bills, 1½ months after the fiscal year ended. Why are

they trying to muddy it up with Medicare? Medicare? Medicare is not an appropriation bill.

The reality is, before the session ends, we need to deal with Medicare, but we do not need to adopt their extreme agenda of $270 billion of cuts in Medicare, either to stabilize Medicare or to balance the budget. We do not have to increase the premiums on millions of poor elderly in the fashion that they are trying to do today, for either purpose of stabilizing Medicare or balancing the budget.

But we should not be arguing that today, on a continuing appropriation bill. Why do they try and put it on? Just to make sure the President will veto it. They can pretend they have done something. They know it is not going to happen. It is phony. But why are they even dealing with Medicare? Because they have not been able to deal with the budget, 1½ months after the fiscal year ended.

You should have been doing that, what you are doing now, in July, but you were off chasing butterflies or something, not doing your work, not getting it organized, so now you come with this dumb bill, crazy provisions in it, trying to stick it to the seniors in this country. We should vote no.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, although I do not plan to use much of it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are obviously unhappy with the 537 Federal elected officials, the 435 of us in this House, 100 Members in the U.S. Senate, and the two people elected in the executive branch. They are unhappy as they watch this bickering that is going on over this battle that we have.

Today is a Federal holiday. Tomorrow is actually Veterans Day, but we are marking it today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and many of our colleagues hope very much to be able to participate in events. That is one of the reasons we have tried to limit this debate, which is simply on the rule, so we can allow Members to have a chance to vote for or against this continuing resolution.

But as we proceed with this, it seems to me that it is very important to recognize what it is that got us to this point. Between 1977 and 1987, there were 63 continuing resolutions. We hear this criticism of this process but we are, right now, struggling to move toward a balanced budget. While people are unhappy with the bickering that is going on today, I am convinced that they are much more unhappy with the prospect of perpetuating that business as usual. That business as usual has been a pattern which has led to doing nothing more than passing onto the shoulders of future generations the responsibility of continuing profligate spending.

So what is is that we are saying? We are saying that as we move ahead with this continuing resolution, we should put into place the kinds of things that the American people want, that will reduce the size and scope of government, recognize that we must save the Medicare system, rather than allowing it to go bankrupt, as the President's Commission on Medicare said in their April 3 study that came out.

So it seems to me we have a responsibility to do the right thing. Everyone is unhappy with the fact that we are bickering. I am unhappy with the fact that we are here today. The fact of the matter is that we are doing the people's business. We want to do that right now by passing out this rule, so we can proceed with the debate on the continuing resolution. Then let us get the two people who were elected by all the American people at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to sit down and come to an agreement, so that we can ensure that by the year 2002 we are able to pass on to the children of the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], who will at that point be graduating from high school, a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursaunt to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until after debate on House Resolution 262.

□ 1100

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 118, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 118, a clean CR, and ask its immediate consideration in the House.

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 gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of seeing to it that the Government does not come to a halt, when is the next point at which I might offer that motion to have a simple, clean, 1-month CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not be able to entertain such request until such time as it is cleared.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 262 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 262

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, with any Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the majority leader or his designe to dispose of all Senate amendments. Any Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except any such demand made by the majority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], 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.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 262 is a very simple, but very necessary, resolution providing for the further consideration of H.R. 2586, legislation which temporarily increases the statutory limit on the public debt.

Specifically, the resolution provides for the consideration in the House, without any intervening point of order, of a motion if offered by the majority leader or his designee to dispose of any Senate amendments to H.R. 2586, the debt ceiling extension bill.

The rule also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees.

The rule further provides that the previous question is ordered to final adoption without intervening motion or a demand for a division of the question unless such a demand is made by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the aisle cannot overstate the importance of passing this legislation and ensuring the continued confidence in