things that have been said by the last few speakers.

My good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, said if this bill is passed, Social Security checks will not be able to be paid. Well, that is simply not the case, and if the gentleman would read the bill, which I have right here, he would see very clearly, on page 3 of the printed text of the bill, it is clear that payment of such benefits or administrative expenses may be, in fact, paid.

So my good friend from Massachusetts is just incorrect in asserting that Social Security benefits would not be paid.

Second, my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], asked rhetorically I presume from his perspective who do we trust to protect Social Security, the President or NEWT GINGRICH? While that got a good laugh from his Democratic colleagues, the fact is what we are trying to do today is make it so that we do not have to trust anybody. It will be the law that the President, no matter who he is, cannot violate the Social Security trust fund.

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

Mr. MCCRERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, my question is, if the Republicans felt so strongly about it, why did they attach all the other provisions to the bill? A simple line that they would just deal with Social Security would pass this place 435 to nothing. In my judgment, there is a game going on here.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would submit to the gentleman that the Social Security and Medicare trust funds account for fully half of the total value of the Federal Government's trust funds. So it is very important that we recognize that these two trust funds will be critical in any exigent circumstance if the President wishes to get around the debt ceiling.

So the fact that we have contained in this bill other trust funds should not obscure the fact that in order to protect all of them, including the Civil Service trust fund which the President intends to tap today and the Social Security trust fund, this bill must be passed.

I would say to the gentleman that we do not need to trust the President or NEWT GINGRICH, we need to pass this bill in order to make it law that the President cannot tap the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCRERY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, is it not true that what we are trying to do is to make sure that those taxes are deducted from payroll collection and are deposited into the Treasury and that they then, further, are invested into the trust fund and the trust fund can actually invest them into Government securities? But we want to make sure, once deposited into the Treasury, they do not stay in the Treasury, that they are then further transferred into the Social Security trust fund?

The President's statement is actually factual. He will not deal with the trust fund, but he wants to deal with the Treasury while the money is in the Treasury prior to going to the trust fund.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Spaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the minority leader tried to couch this argument in terms of giving tax breaks for the rich and all the like. That is once again trying to obscure the issue. The issue is, do we want to protect the Social Security trust fund, the Medicare trust fund from being raided by the executive branch in order to circumvent the debt ceiling, which under the Constitution must be raised by the Congress, by the legislative branch?

I urge all my colleagues to protect the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund and vote ''aye'' on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 2621, a transparent political gesture by the Republic leadership. This is nothing more than Speaker NEWT GINGRICH and other House Republican leaders trying to blackmail the President into accepting their Medicare premium increase as part of a temporary Government funding bill. Congress under its new leadership has utterly failed to complete its constitutional responsibility to fund the Federal Government this year. Instead of playing high stakes political games with the hopes and fears of Federal employees, retirees, and Social Security and Medicare beneficiaries, Republican leaders would be well advised to finish the work they should have finished more than 1 month ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2621.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCCRERY. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Why are we postponing this vote? Can we not vote now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will postpone the vote until after the veto message is disposed of. It is at the discretion of the Chair to do so, and this vote will be postponed.

Mr. GIBBONS. But, Mr. Speaker, we are all here. It is 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is an inquiry so that people will know what is going on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote will be postponed until after the veto message from the President is disposed of.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SECOND CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–134)

The Speaker laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.J. 115, the Second Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 1996.

This legislation would raise Medicare premiums on senior citizens, and deeply cut education and environmental protection, as the cost for keeping the government running. Those are conditions that are not necessary to meet my goal of balancing the budget.

If I signed my name to this bill now, millions of elderly couples all across this country would be forced to sign away $264 more in Medicare premiums next year, premium hikes that are not necessary to balance the budget. If America must close down access to quality education, a clean environment and affordable health care for our seniors, in order to keep the Government open, then that price is too high.

We don't need these cuts to balance the budget. And we do not need big cuts in education and the environment to balance the budget. I have proposed a balanced budget without these cuts.

I will continue to fight for my principles: a balanced budget that does not undermine Medicare, education or the environment, and that does not raise taxes on working families. I will not take steps that I believe will weaken our Nation, harm our people and limit our future as the cost of temporarily keeping the Government open.

I continue to be hopeful that we can find common ground on balancing the budget. With this veto, it is now up to the Congress to take the reasonable and responsible course. They can still avoid a government shutdown.

Congress still has the opportunity to pass clean continuing resolution and debt ceiling bills. These straightforward measures would allow the United States Government to keep functioning and meet its obligations, without attempting to force the acceptance of Republican budget priorities.

Indeed, when Congress did not pass the 13 appropriations bills to fund the

Government for fiscal year 1996 by September 30, we agreed on a fair continuing resolution that kept the Government operating and established a level playing field while Congress completed its work.

Now, more than six weeks later, Congress still has sent me only three bills that I have been able to sign. Indeed, I am pleased to be signing the Energy and Water bill today. This bill is the result of a cooperative effort between my Administration and the Congress. It shows that when we work together, we can produce good legislation.

We can have a fair and open debate about the best way to balance the budget. America can balance the budget without extreme cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education or the environment—and that is what we must do.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 13, 1995.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and joint resolution will be printed as a House document.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LIVINGSTON

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LIVINGSTON moves to postpone consideration of the President's veto message on the joint resolution H.J. Res. 115, until Friday, December 1, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to postpone the veto message of the President on the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 115, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], pending which, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, my motion to postpone handling the message of the President vetoing House Joint Resolution 115, the proposed second continuing resolution to December 1, is a simple, expeditious way to deal with this matter. The votes to override this veto are not there. Postponing handling this matter to December 1 now will remove it from the immediate schedule of the House so that it can get on with more pressing business.

I urge all Members to support this motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, before I start, I want to wish a belated happy anniversary to my distinguished friend from Louisiana. I understand how he felt when last night, in the midst of everything that was happening, he was trying to celebrate his 30th wedding anniversary and a few other things got in the way. I know how that feels.

Let me also say that I think I know my friend from Louisiana well enough to know that he is not very happy with the situation in which we find ourselves. Neither is any other thoughtful Member of this House. Because there is no reason for this impasse to exist on the appropriation bill.

We have two very different discussions going on. One relates to the need to raise the debt ceiling, and that subject is real and ought to be dealt with separately.

In fact, we have three issues. The second issue is what ought to happen in the multiyear budget reconciliation fight, which is occurring now in this Capitol.

Then the third issue is whether or not the Government is simply going to be allowed to conduct its business while we finish the job that we have had given to us of passing all 13 appropriation bills so that we can at least keep the Government functioning in its basic operations.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be primarily directed at our moderate friends on the Republican side of the aisle because I, frankly, think that they at this point are the only ones who have sufficient leverage to help end this impasse.

The problem that we are faced with now is that, frankly, we are wrapped around the axle; and the Government, because of that, is rapidly falling into disrepute with most Americans. I think that the choice of what happens is largely in the hands of the moderate Republicans who, I think, have a crucial choice to make. I think they have to choose whether or not they are going to continue to show the same kind of statesmanship which they showed on the Stokes amendment on the HUD appropriation bill a few weeks, or a few days ago when they joined with us to jettison 17 extraneous items, or whether or not they are going to continue to make alliance with the 75 most extreme Members of their caucus and, in the process, hold an awful lot of innocent people hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this is not the first time that we have had a political impasse associated with appropriation bills. We have had a number of continuing resolutions required in the past. But the fact is that in almost all cases those arguments involved political divisions between the President and the Congress and, in most instances, they involved the failure of a legislative product to be accepted by one branch or another.

□ 1315

That is not what is happening here. What is happening here is that we had the leadership of this House, most especially the Speaker, simply determine that an extraneous matter was going to be brought into the appropriation process, and that it was going to be wedged into that process, in hopes that his agenda could be leveraged through by threatening to hold up the ability of the Government to function, and that issue in Medicare. So we were told over the weekend that we had to buy into the idea that Medicare premiums would be essentially more than doubled and we had to start the process now by dragging it into this appropriation debate.

Then, Mr. Speaker, last night, just when it was clear to most people, I believe, that the majority party was taking a drubbing in the court of public opinion on that matter, then all of a sudden that was cast aside and now the great cause to them has been whether or not somehow people are going to commit to a 7-year balanced budget.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very interesting debate, but it does not belong on this bill, it does not belong on this instrument, because what we ought to be doing here is to simply keep the Government open until we have time to finish the appropriations work that so far the Congress has not done.

The Congress institutionally has no business trying to blackmail the President into buying into someone else's vision on an entirely different cluster of issues simply in order to make up for the fact that the Congress has not yet finished its appropriation business, as this chart demonstrates.

What this chart demonstrates is that only 3 appropriations bills, Military Construction, Agriculture, and Energy and Water, have been passed by the Congress and sent to the President for his signature, and have have had the benefit of the President's signature. Agriculture and Energy and Water is at the White House and soon will become law, but all of the rest of the bills are stuck, at this point, not in the White House, but in the Congress, in the legislative process.

The Transportation bill has not yet been finished by the Congress. The Legislative bill on its second round has not been finished by the Congress. Treasury-Post Office has been hung up for almost 60 days by an extraneous matter, the Istook amendment. The Interior Department appropriation bill has been hung up again on extraneous matters, including how much of a political favor this Congress is going to continue to give to mining companies.

Mr. Speaker, Foreign Operations is tied up because of the abortion issue; it is tied up again in the Congress. VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, they have been held up for eons, it seems, because of those 17 environmental riders that were attached by the majority party. The Defense bill at this point is

hung up on a combination of arguments over spending levels and the abortion issue.

The District of Columbia bill has barely made it through the starting gate in this House. Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary has not even met yet in conference, and the Labor-HHS bill passed the House in such extreme form that the Republican chairman of the subcommittee himself is embarrassed by it, and it is clearly the case that the Republican majority in the Senate is so embarrassed by that extremism that they will not even take the bill up, and they cannot even agree to pass it on a voice vote with no one being on record because that bill is so bad.

Now, there is only one way out of this, and the way out of this is not to have the President cave in to the Speaker's extraneous demands. The way out of it is to simply extend the ability of Government to do its business and serve our constituents, I would hope for 1 month at a time, but if that cannot be done, then it ought to be extended 1 day at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly happy to stand here all day today and tomorrow or for as long as it takes and continue to offer that motion in the hopes that at some time sanity will prevail and the leadership of this House will recognize that the entire Government of the United States should not be held hostage to the whims of one political leader with an extreme agenda.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that rather than debating all of these extraneous issues, even if we have deep partisan divisions on all of the other issues remaining, there should not be a partisan issue between us on the issue of whether or not the Government performs its basic duties on a day-to-day basis. That is why, again, I would urge our moderate friends on the Republican side of the aisle to join with us, not to adopt any agenda that we have, not to reject any agenda that your leadership might have, but simply to perform the ministerial function of keeping the Government open, keeping it running while we have these other debates for as long as they take.

In the end, the President is not being held hostage; the American people are being held hostage. That should not be allowed to continue, and I would urge our friends on that side of the aisle to reconsider the action that they have been taking by allowing this impasse to continue. I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his nice remarks regarding my wedding anniversary and acknowledging that I see him more than I see my wife.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and others on this side of the aisle, since 1979 we have had 55 continuing resolutions, and in 1987 and 1988 we ran this whole place on continuing resolutions. So for the gentleman from Wisconsin to get up and hue and cry about how we are running this place on continuing resolutions when the Democratic Party ran this place for years and years on continuing resolutions is just not stating the facts correctly.

So I want to clear the air and say, God bless his soul, I know what he is talking about, but the bottom line is, in 1987 and 1988 they ran this whole place, because they were so disorganized they could not even get one appropriations bill passed, and the bottom line is 55 continuing resolutions were pushed by that party.

So what we are doing this year is we are trying to bring it all together much more quickly than the historical perspective we have seen from the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out something else to my colleagues, and this is some form of the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which will ensure that the Clinton administration does not try to circumvent the Congress when the Government reaches the Federal debt limit, especially at a time when the Federal debt, as of noon today, was $4 trillion, 986 billion, and on and on and on cents. This turns out to be about $18,908.01 of each citizen's share of the debt.

Mr. Speaker, without the provisions in this bill, the Clinton administration will dip into supposedly safe Federal trust funds such as the social security trust fund, the Medicare trust fund and the Federal retiree trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong and unacceptable. Yesterday the President vetoed this bill because we refused to let the administration raid the Social Security, Medicare, and Federal retiree trust funds, yet this President also claims that he is the one trying to protect the seniors.

What he does not say is that he will spend their hard-earned dollars to prolong this budgetary crisis. These trust funds should not see their assets reduced, even temporarily, as it sets a bad precedent of encouraging the Treasury Department to raid these funds. Without this bill that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has provided, the money paid into these funds would be diverted to pay for other services.

This is not why the American people paid into these trust funds. The American people have placed their trust in us to manage their Government and to protect their investments.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let them down. The Archer bill will protect these funds, enforce the limits that this Congress has already set. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and also to pass a balanced budget plan that will eliminate the need for such legislation in the future.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, just to point out to the gentleman that he has pointed out certain factors of history, and I would like to point out some rather more recent history.

Last year, when I chaired the Committee on Appropriations, we had 13 appropriations bill, and all 13 of them passed on time. There was no need to pass a continuing resolution because of the failure of a single appropriations bill, and the reason that happened is because we determined on this side of the aisle not to follow an ideological agenda, but we determined, and I decided as my first act as chairman, that I would simply step across the aisle and talk to the ranking Republican and work out a bipartisan division of funds between all 13 bills.

Mr. Speaker, we did that, we had a bipartisan product and we had a bipartisan finish, and as a result, the entire House was able to finish its work product.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], I am sure, had he been left to his own devices would have done the same, but the fact is he has been given a different set of marching orders, and I understand that. However, I do think if the gentleman is going to talk about ancient history, I think he ought to talk about recent history as well, and I simply want to bring that to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the gentleman would not yield to me, yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for what he did last year, but is it not true that under your party since 1979, we have had 55 continuing resolutions?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is true that we have had a number of them, although I do not know what the specific number is.

All I would say to the gentleman is that the issue is not the past, the issue is what should we do now and what are we going to do to make tomorrow better. We are not going to make tomorrow better by standing here and holding our breath. We need to keep the Government open.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I urge Members to vote against this motion. I strongly believe that we should vote today on whether or not we are going to override this veto so that we can clear the decks

to begin talking about what kind of a continuing appropriation we can put in place.

The issue is today, and the issue is what happens to real people, because as we stand here locked in a disagreement over the budget, which is a disagreement we ultimately have to deal with, in the meantime, real Americans are being affected negatively by our inability to even pass a continuing resolution to keep the Government operating.

Now, a lot of people have said well, the essential services will be taken care of, and I guess yes, the airplanes will still be able to fly, because we are going to have air controllers out there working today, and the aircraft carriers will be in the water because they are essential. I assume the meat inspectors will be on the job so that we do not get some bad hamburger or chicken.

However, you need to understand that on a typical day like today, 20,000 Americans apply for Social Security, retirement and survivors' benefits, or disability insurance, but because Social Security Administration employees are furloughed, 20,000 Americans every day, including today, will be denied their ability to get these benefits. There is simply not going to be an office open for them to go to.

Also on a typical day like today, anywhere between 2,000 and 3,000 veterans apply for veterans' compensation and veterans' pensions, but because the Department of Veterans Affairs' employees are furloughed today, several thousand veterans who have served their country will be greeted by closed doors when they go to get their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is not necessary. This is happening, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said, because the Speaker wants to use the Government being closed or open as leverage to get the President to agree to something with regard to the budget. It is leverage the Speaker does not need.

□ 1330

The President is committed to balancing the budget. There is an argument over the details of how that is done and how fast it is done and what the elements of it are, but he is agreeing with the Speaker that we ought to try to balance the budget, and he is willing to do that. But we are hurting innocent American taxpayers who have paid their taxes and fought our wars and now simply want to be treated as they were promised to be treated.

I have asked the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], to get up today, maybe on a couple of occasions, and offer a resolution that he has already put in that would simply extend the continuing appropriation for 24 hours. I cannot understand how anyone could not want to extend the continuing appropriation for 24 hours.

Let us keep the veterans' offices open for 24 more hours, so that we can continue the dialog over the budget. If we have not completed it by tomorrow at this time, let us do another 24 hours. When we had the budget summit in 1990, we did a number of 48-hour continuing appropriations. There is no reason we cannot do that today.

I plead with the majority in this Congress, and I plead with the Speaker. Let us use common sense and common decency. Let us do a 24-hour continuing appropriation.

The gentleman from Wisconsin will be on his feet today, maybe on a number of occasions, and will be back here every day on a number of occasions to offer, if we are allowed to do it, a 24-hour continuing appropriation. Let us not take this out on the American people. Let us do what is decent and right. Let us do 24-hour continuing appropriations so that the Government can continue and we can continue trying to do what we were sent here to do, which is to balance the budget on sensible terms.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the minority leader from Missouri asked a reasonable question: Why not 24 hours? Donna Washington used to sing about 24 little hours. The name of that song was ''What a Difference a Day Makes.'' Because frankly what the Democrats are trying to do in terms of playing politics is now, thank goodness, completely out in the open.

We have talked about our problems and the difficulty of trying to explain to the American people why we had to place holding the line on the Medicare premium in the continuing resolution, and the Democrats have said, ''Well, gee, why do we have to do this? Why don't we just drop it?'' Now their plea is just 24 hours, just 1 day.

In today's Wall Street Journal, for those who do not receive it, it lays out completely why the Democrats have been doing what they are doing. Initially it had been to pander to seniors: ''We don't want to have you to have to pay more for Medicare, that in fact we believe it should be lower.''

In the Wall Street Journal today an administration official, quote, involved in the budget deliberations privately concedes that keeping Medicare premiums at the current level, quote, would not be the worst thing in the world in the context of an overall balanced budget package.

In fact, everyone, either publicly Republicans or privately Democrats, agree that the premium structure is part of the solution for seniors. As a matter of fact, the American Association of Retired Persons said, and this is John Rother, their legislative director, ''What we have said is that we recognize that seniors need to be part of the solution,'' he says. ''Sacrifice is better borne by premium increases rather than through higher deductibles and copayments which affect the sickest beneficiaries the most.''

House Republicans have opposed the other side's plan to increase deductibles and to increase co-pays. We only are dealing with the premium. Why in the world would Republicans then put a premium on a continuing resolution and make that the issue?

Very simply. The President has said they are going to go ahead and reprogram the computers in the Social Security Administration tomorrow.

Notwithstanding the fact this would affect the checks in January, notwithstanding the fact that the administration knows part of a reasonable agreement is the premium, they are going to reprogram those computers tomorrow so that when an agreement is made, the seniors will see their checks go down and then their checks go back up when everybody agrees the premium is the solution. But when will the seniors see their checks change? In February and March, in the high season of politics, in the campaign for the Presidency, the President will say, ''Republicans made me do it.''

So we took a defensive measure. We said, ''No, let's argue the CR now and the premium rate now.''

If the President will offer a gentleman's agreement that we will hold off on reprogramming the computers, our problem is solved. Guess what? We cannot get a gentleman's agreement out of the President. He wants to scare seniors for political reasons. He wants to argue we are trying to destroy Medicare, and he is going to stand in the way of stopping us, notwithstanding the fact everyone over here honestly knows the premium rate is part of the solution.

This is, shocked if you may be, all about politics, and the ability of the President to posture himself as a savior notwithstanding his understanding that the solution is the premium. If we had gotten a gentleman's agreement out of the President to do the right thing, hold off on reprogramming the computers even until the end of the week, so that our reconciliation bill can be debated, we would not have done what we did.

Why are they now standing here saying they want a clean CR for 24 hours? Because that is the right thing to do? Because it is the appropriate thing to do? No, it is politics. Because in 24 hours, they can then reprogram the computers. A clean CR for 24 hours gives them a political point-scoring debate in April and May.

We knew what they were going to do. We said that is unacceptable. We said let's make sure that part of the solution is not part of the political problem.

That is why Republicans put holding the line on the beneficiaries' part of the part B premium on the continuing

resolution, to stop the President from this kind of political game playing. They will tell you it is for good and worthy purposes. It is for down-in-the-dirt gutter politics, and you people are going to pay.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the gentleman's words to be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1340

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, under the procedures triggered by my request, is the gentleman supposed to be discussing this directly with the Parliamentarian?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman is correct on the question. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] should be seated.

The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

We said let us make sure that part of the solution is not part of the political problem. That is why the Republicans put holding the line on the beneficiaries' part of the part B premium on the continuing resolution, to stop the President from this kind of political game playing. They will tell you it is for good and worthy purposes. It is for down-in-the-dirt gutter politics, and you people are going to pay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, it does not appear that this is a personal reference to any Member or to the President.

The Chair would caution all Members to show proper respect to the Members of the Congress and to the President.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I will not challenge the ruling of the Chair in the interest of comity, but I do want to observe that when the gentleman says that something was done for reasons of down-and-dirty gutter politics and then he points his finger over here and says. ''You will pay,'' there is no doubt in my mind who he is talking about. He told me privately that he was not talking about us. He was talking about the President of the United States. I do not believe that the rules of the House ought to allow anyone's motives to be impugned, whether they are a Member of the House or the President of the United States.

I hope the gentleman will not deny that statement.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate his at least being honest, indicating that I told you privately and this gentleman certainly appreciates the way in which you honor private conversations, and it will be remembered.

Mr. OBEY. I did not consider that to be a private conversation. I considered it to be a conversation made on the floor of the peoples' House.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you characterize it as that?

Mr. OBEY. Get your own time.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you characterize it as that?

Mr. OBEY. Get your own time. Once today you ought to follow the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

It is not my purpose, and I am not going to get suckered into a personal exchange with the gentleman. All I can say is when the gentleman tells me, without benefit of microphone, that he meant to impugn the motives of the President of the United States, I think that that is the kind of conduct that deserves the attention of the House, and I make no apology whatsoever in making that comment public.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, why are we engaged in this heated debate? Why have we shut down the Federal Government? The answer is on this chart. It needs to be updated in this respect: Three of the thirteen appropriations bills have been passed by the Gingrich-led Congress.

As a result, 10 of these appropriations bills which keep the Government functioning have not even been submitted by the Republicans in the House and the Senate for the President's approval. They are literally 6 weeks late in their statutory obligation to pass appropriations bills, to keep the Government running.

What they are saying today is that they want to postpone this process even longer.

Remember, just a few short months ago when Mr. GINGRICH and his group of revolutionaries came in and said there will be a new day in the House of Representatives? Well, now we know what it is; it is Government shutdown, it is mismanagement, it is a waste of Federal taxpayers' dollars. For all of the arguments made on the other side, this chart tells that story. In 10 out of 13 cases, the Gingrich-led Congress failed to lead.

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

I keep looking at that chart over there they keep pulling up, and I noticed it is in error. He forgot Energy and Water has been signed into law. It does not reflect that.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, that is what the gentleman from Illinois just said.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It shows you how much I listen.

Mr. Speaker, look, the military construction bill has been signed into law. The agriculture bill has been signed into law. Now we know that the energy and water development bill has been signed into law, as the gentleman from Illinois evidently acknowledged. The transportation bill will be signed into law presumably within days. The legislative branch bill went down to the President, and for no reason at all he vetoed it just to show that he could. Maybe he needed some exercise for his pen hand. I am not sure. But he vetoed it.

In that bill we would cut the cost of doing business in the U.S. Congress by 9 percent compared to last year. To this day, over 5 or 6 weeks since he vetoed it, I have not heard the first good, valid, reasonable explanation of why it was vetoed.

My friends who have gotten up and expounded about the slowness of the process fully understand that this has happened before. In fact, over the last 15 years, we have operated under 55 continuing resolutions. This was to be our second this year. That is not unusual. We have had 15 separate budget confrontations, much like we are having today, in the last 15 years. So this is not unusual. In fact, it was not an uncommon way of doing business for the Democrats when they were the majority party to operate under continuing resolution. In 1988 all 13 appropriations bills and in 1987, as well, were included in a continuing resolution for the full year.

Now we keep hearing that we are late, we are late, we are not getting our work done. Look, when the President gratuitously vetoes a bill, obviously we have to have some hesitation about keeping on sending bills down, after going through all the process of hearings and subcommittees and full committees, passing them on the floor; the same thing in the Senate; finally getting to conference. If you finally send the bill down to the President, and he says, ''I do not like it today. I got up on the wrong side of the bed. I will veto this bill.'' That is not the traditional process, and it seems to me that my friends on the Democrat side know that we have had legitimate disputes about one or two issues in the foreign operations bill. We have had legitimate differences about a single issue in the Treasury-Postal bill. We have had two or three issues in the Interior bill where there have been legitimate disputes between the House position and the Senate position; one issue in the national security bill; a difference in funding levels between Commerce, Justice, and the State Departments bill; and in the VA–HUD bill, well, you have got some real differences of opinion between the House and the Senate and between Members of both parties in the VA–HUD bill, and that one has taken longer.

For the District of Columbia bill, likewise, there has been a lot of discussion, a lot of dissension about this bill, and the Labor-Health bill, frankly, has not even passed the other body. That is not because of the majority. I understand that it is primarily because of the minority conducting a filibuster on the Labor-Health bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is the American people know we have passed every one of these bills. There is not

one of these bills we have not passed. The House has taken its normal traditional action on all of these bills, and now they are working their way through conference, and within the next couple of weeks, the date the continuing resolution that just got vetoed by the President would have expired, frankly, we could have finished this business. We could have concluded.

But, you know, I think it is really ironic that were talking about the failure of the appropriations process to work its will when the other party, the minority party, when it was the majority, acted so grossly in excess of anything that we have done so far. It is pathetic.

But, the real issue seems to be the fact that the folks on the other side of the aisle do not want to face up to the fact that this new majority, for the first time in 60 years, is headed down the path toward fiscal responsibility and is determined to put the United States of America on a fiscally strong footing by balancing the budget and thereby providing huge benefits to every citizen in America.

We are going to bring down interest rates. The cost of housing, of education, of retirement is all going to come down because we are going to finally balance the budget for the first time in I do not know how many years. We have only balanced the budget three times since World War II. We are going to put this country back on a track toward a balanced budget because we are going to get spending in line with revenues.

I think that that is a good thing. Our friends on the other side should be standing up and cheering for what we are doing, but all we hear is criticism. We also see them hiding behind the President's statement in his veto message in which he says, ''We do not need the cuts in this continuing resolution to balance the budget. We do not need big cuts in education and environment to balance the budget.'' He said, ''I have proposed a balanced budget without these cuts and without others.''

The fact is the President's proposal, the only really significant proposal that he gave us in February when he submitted the budget to Congress, had no balanced budget; $200 billion of deficits this year, the next year, the year after that, no balanced budget for as far as the eye could see. And yet he says he has got a plan to balance the budget.

Whre is it? It was not in his campaign when he said he could balance the budget in 5 years. It was not in his February budget when he said he could not balance the budget. It was not 2 years ago when he raised taxes on the American people by the greatest amount in the history of the country. It is not in his mid-year review which CBO still scared $200 billion a year to beyond 2005—his 10-year balance.

Now where is the balanced budget, Mr. President? He has indicated he has got a plan. The only thing I have seen is about 2 pages long that is not a plan at all. But he can carp at ours. He can criticize ours. He can veto our legislative branch bill. He can veto our continuing resolution. He can veto our debt ceiling. He can veto maybe all of the other bills that we send him.

But, Mr. President, you cannot just say ''no.'' You have got to say ''yes'' to something. Where is the plan, Mr. President? Where is the beef?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of rhetoric over the last few days. I have heard so many speeches. I just cannot believe that the American people really understand what is going on, because they have been filled with fluff. But when it gets right down to it, who really has that plan to put America back on track to fiscal sanity? We do. And we are going to implement it with or without the other side.

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

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have a slightly different spin on the last speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I take no affront to most of what you said, I say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

But, you know, the problem we have is when the 55 CRs were being discussed on this side, I oppose my leadership on that just as I wished you were opposing your leadership on why we are here today.

The issue today is not Social Security. It is not Medicare. It is not balancing the budget. The issue before us is as to whether we are going to have Government continue while we do our work. No matter how you spin it, the bottom line of this particular resolution and this particular argument, Congress has not completed but three of our legislative appropriation bills.

If we had all 13, we would not be here. The Department of Agriculture is functioning today because we did our work. The legislative appropriations, I voted against it, I say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. Why? Because we did not cut ourselves as much. I thought we ought to cut Congress as much as we did the executive branch. We did not do it. I voted ''no.'' I was glad the President vetoed it. I was disappointed he did not make the same point I did.

I got criticized by folks on your side of the aisle for doing that.

You know, we have not done our work. That is the bottom line. The President cannot get involved until we do ours.

We have 68 Democrats who have already said we are for balancing the budget. If you want to deal with these peripheral issues, let us get on with doing our work. Let us put us all on the line.

But that is not what we are talking about today. Why cannot we do our work? Why can we not send 13 appropriation bills to the President? Why have we brought the Government down because we have not done our work and tried to blame the President because we have not done our work?

Now, ''we'' means me, because I am getting tarred by the same thing the majority is refusing to do. But I am tired of taking it, and I would like to have the blame for this particular bill go where it belongs. The majority has not don it's work.

□ 1400

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, just in response to my good friend from Texas, who has been a valiant warrior for a balanced budget for this country, and I commend him on his efforts, I think the gentleman has failed to properly characterize the work ethic of this Congress.

With all due respect to the gentleman's comments, this Congress, certainly this House of Representatives, has passed more legislation than any in my memory, and probably than any Congress since the first term of FDR. So to say that we have failed to do our work I do not think appropriately characterizes this House's work.

The gentleman is correct that we have failed to timely pass all of our appropriations bills; that is to say, we have failed to pass all 13 appropriations bills before the October 1 beginning of the fiscal new year. And that is regrettable. However, the gentleman knows full well that for the first time in 40 years, this Congress enjoys a new majority, a new leadership, and we hoped a new direction for the country. And in an effort to change the direction of this country, we had to necessarily take up a good part of the first part of this year in passing legislation that we thought and we hoped would start the country in a new, better direction.

Consequently, we were put behind somewhat on the appropriations process. But the gentleman knows well that that can be remedied very easily by adopting a continuing resolution, which is what we did. The President has now vetoed that for his own reasons, and we must now try to pass another continuing resolution eventually, so that this Government can continue to operate.

I just wanted to take issue with the gentleman's comments about the work ethic of this House.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I did not cast any dispersions intentionally on the work ethic of the Congress. I readily concur with the gentleman's statement.

My only point was it seems to me that the business as usual that you have rightfully complained about, and I have joined you with, is now being perpetuated at a level of which we have not seen in a long time on one particular issue, and that is the continuing.

If we could just send a clean continuing resolution, get on with doing our work and allow a little more bipartisanship in it, I believe we would all do better.

My only point today was we are blaming the President for doing something that we have not done, regardless of the merits. We have taken 318 days to get to this point. We spent the last four debating this. Why have we not been sending the appropriation bills down to the President so he can sign them? That is my only point.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker. reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows that the President has already vetoed one of the appropriations bills that we sent to him, and has threatened to veto other appropriations bills. But we will get that work done. We have done our work in this House. We are waiting on the other body to complete its work. We will get the work done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I know my chairman likes this chart, so I put it back up. I am the ranking member on one of these subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. What we are about is laying off employees, furloughing employees today. On this Treasury-Postal bill, we cover 192,000 Federal employees. Of that, approximately 95,000 of them were at 11 o'clock today told to go home.

I do not question the work ethic; I question the work smartness. This bill, as my chairman so well knows, should have passed 60 days ago. But because, very frankly, 100 of our most zealotry Members, what an awful word that is, want to pass an amendment that cannot pass the Senate, forget about the President, cannot pass the Senate, the Istook-Ehrlich amendment, which was rejected by the U.S. Senate on the continuing resolution, because they cannot pass that, this bill sits here for that reason alone.

As of September 13, it was ready to be passed through this House and be signed by the President of the United States. So, because of that extreme commitment to one unrelated appropriation issue, this bill stands mired in a political morass, and 95,000 people were sent home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my reasonable colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democrat side of the aisle, let us join together and do what we know makes sense, and that is provide for the operations of these departments, which everybody wants to do. Let us do the reasonable thing and provide for the operation of government, and then, as the public expects us to do, argue, contend, on the issues of difference between us and follow the regular process.

This is not the right thing to do. This is not the smart thing to do. This is not in the best interests of America or the American public.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question I have been asking around here for the past 2 days: Is there anything that is put in this CR and the debt extension that could not be done through the regular channels in this House?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the answer to that is nothing, and the Treasury-Postal bill could pass right now if the chairman would ask unanimous consent that it come to the floor. We could pass it right now, Mr. Speaker, and send it to the President. I believe without the Istook-Ehrlich, the President would sign it, and 95,000 people can come back to work for the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, in case there was some confusion with some of the words just spoken, the Istook amendment was not in the continuing resolution. I was one of the Republicans who opposed the Istook amendment. I am glad it is not there. It was not in the continuing resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I misspoke. It was on the debt extension.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, the whole point that many Members in the minority have made, that we cannot pass a continuing resolution because there are these riders on it, just does not hold water. If you go back and look to the time when the Democrats were in the majority, time and time again there were riders on the continuing resolutions.

In fiscal 1988, the continuing resolutions that year had the Agricultural Aid and Trade Mission Act, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act, the Indo-Chinese Refugee Resettlement Act, the Food Security Act Amendments. Over and over again there have been riders. So for someone to get up and say, ''Well, there has to be a clean bill,'' that person is just not dealing with reality.

I think that the chairman's position is well founded. We need to negotiate something to keep the Government open, but there should be strings, there should be legitimate riders attached. For any Member to get up and say there can be no riders, I think that person is being unrealistic.

I would hope the President would come back to the negotiating table. I would point out to individuals, and people who read the paper this morning will know this, the Speaker offered the President a deal where Medicare would be withdrawn, where there would not be language dealing with the Medicare Program, in exchange for the President to committing to balancing the budget in 7 years. The President did not accept that as a legitimate offer.

I think people should know that indeed the Members of this House who are serious about keeping the Government open and balancing the budget at the same time, have been willing to negotiate in good faith. All we are asking for is the President do the same thing.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for making an excellent point. In the 55 continuing resolutions that took place over the last 15 years when the Democrats were in control of this body, and during the 15 budget confrontations that took place, there were lots and lots of riders attached to these various legislative vehicles. As a matter of fact, one of the most significant that kept this House hog-bound, hog-tied, for weeks, months, and years actually, because there were investigations on top of investigations, was the Boland amendment, which was the amendment passed by the majority back in those days to give comfort to the people who turned out to be the Communist insurgents and the Communists that dominated Nicaragua. This rider virtually assisted those people, led to endless debate, investigations of the President of the United States and all sorts of groundless accusations. That Boland amendment was included on a continuing resolution at least once. It was a rider. It was a rider, the very same nature of which has been complained about by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

So do not tell us it has never been done before. It was always done before. In fact, it was done with incredible excess under their leadership. The Boland amendment is an incredibly vivid example of how they used to do this stuff. We have had a few riders, but we withdrew the Istook amendment because it was so controversial. Now we have just a plain old continuing resolution, with a lot of nominal stuff that the President has reached into the bottom of the barrel and scraped up a reason why he should veto it.

The fact of the matter is, the President just does not want to balance the budget, and that is the plain truth.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier the minority leader suggested that we have a short-term

resolution, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has offered a short-term resolution to this. And the reason is this: Right now CNN is reporting the President is about to go live that the Republicans and the White House have agreed to try and agree, to set aside their differences and agree to try and agree.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] points out, why would we shout down the Government in the face of that? What is wrong with a 24-hour or 48-hour continuing resolution, so the Committee on Appropriations can continue to do its work, so it can send the transportation bill from the Senate?

But this is ridiculous, to start sending people home, calling them back, and sending them home, when in fact the principals now to this agreement have decided they will try and reach an agreement, which is a far different situation than we had an hour ago and we had yesterday.

So the point is this: That we do not have to inflict either the cost or the pain on the recipients, the Social Security recipients, the veterans recipients, that the minority leader referenced earlier. We ought to do this and get on with the business of this House and the Congress and finish our work.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is nonsense. It is no way to run a company, and certainly no way to run a nation. We were sent here to do the people's business, but the fact is that the leadership of this House has failed to meet well-known and statutory deadlines. So, now, rather than act responsibly, we are engaging in a political shouting match on the American people's time and the American people's money. That is irresponsible.

The Republican majority controls both houses, and yet it has only passed 4 of 13 appropriations bills, 3 of which have been signed into law. They did not even send him this bill until a few hours before the last deadline. They are asking the President to negotiate on bills that their majority has not even passed and sent to the White House. Their leadership has failed the test of process, not to mention policy.

Today we fight to the death over a short-term measure. What happens next? Now we are going to engage in a symbolic exercise of shutting down the Government and throwing a temper tantrum. My children do that. They were not elected to serve the people's interests.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues on the other side to reject this nonsense, to get some business sense, to get some common sense. Let us bring a clean bill we can pass, and let us get back to doing the people's business we were sent here to do.

□ 1415

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership in this. I think we are at a very, very clear and critical crossroad. We have over 800,000 Americans being sent home at this moment because we have not finished the bills, all these many, many days after the due date.

We now understand that there is an agreement between the President and the Republicans to try to meet and work out these agreements, their differences. We also understand that there is a letter from the Speaker saying to these 800,000-plus people who are being sent home that they are going to be paid anyway.

Now, why do we not adopt the gentleman from Wisconsin's resolution for a 24-hour clean continuing; and then if something falls apart with the President we do not have to do it tomorrow, but let us keep it going. Why are we sending home people when we are going to pay them anyway? I want them to be paid, but that is crazy. Adopt the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have only one remaining speaker, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it's a good idea to go outside the beltway to get a better understanding of what is happening here in Washington. In yesterday's USA Today, a letter to the editor from Joann Rossall of Snohomish, WA, hit the nail on the head when it comes to the Government shutdown.

It reads:

> It seems to me if Gingrich and his troops had done the job that I and every other citizen in this country pay them to do, they would have presented a finished budget over six weeks ago.
>
> Republicans knew the budget was due by Oct. 1—they've had elephants and clowns at the Capital, they've had wild animals parading up the halls, but they haven't done the job they were hired to do.

Joann Rossall hit the nail right on the head. If it weren't for the Gingrich public relations extravaganza of the first 100 days, we wouldn't be in this mess.

Stop whining and do your job.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I voted for a balanced budget over 7 years, and I support that because I support fiscal responsibility. This is not fiscal responsibility. This is a continuing resolution that Congress needs to pass because it has not finished its work. For Congress then to add items to it that are unrelated to the financial matters at hand is really compounding the problem.

We need to have a clean continuing resolution, we need to have a clean debt limit, because we have not really done our job. It is not the President's responsibility, because the Congress has not even come together with its own budget. I want to work together with my friends on the other side of the aisle to do what is right for America, not what is right for the Republican party or the Democratic party but what we have to do for all the people.

We need to pass a clean continuing resolution. We do not need to compound it with language that is extraneous to the budget matter, and I think that most Americans feel that way, so that we can work in a bipartisan way for America's interests.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say this is a game we are playing because the Republicans wanting to stick this measure and that measure and this doodad and that doodad on this bill is atrocious. It should not be a game. It has a real effect on people.

In my area of New York, 30,000 Federal workers are furloughed; 57,000 veterans may not get their checks; the Statue of Liberty closed, even though hundreds of thousands have come to see it. This is real, and it is completely against the grain of what is right, to try to beat in the street the schoolyard bully, as the other side is doing, and say do it my way or no way.

We should pass a clean, plain vanilla CR, a clean, plain vanilla debt ceiling and then get on and negotiate with the people's business.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate, and I have to agree with much of what I have heard. It is very important that the Congress pass a continuing resolution and that we get on with the major business at hand, which is, of course, wrapping up all of our work here so that Congress can adjourn and we can get on with the fiscal year that has already commenced on October 1.

A couple of points need to be made, though, because they are missing from the debate. We all recall we worked very, very hard here to pass all of our appropriations bills before we adjourned for August. This body has been doing a responsible job, and I want to congratulate the chairman for that effort.

Second, insofar as people saying that doodads are being stuck on the bill or extraneous matters, I do not know whether anyone considers it to be an extraneous matter that both the Senate and the House have passed a plan for a 7-year balanced budget and that the administration, the Clinton administration, and the President himself have refused to accept this overall principle. If we had agreement at that

level, then I think all the rest of this could be quickly negotiated. But the great difficulty here is that, for the first time, certainly in my lifetime, we have a President who is vetoing a congressional spending plan because it does not spend enough money.

When Leon Panetta was at the Congress I was working at the White House, and at that time President Reagan had to veto a continuing resolution with all the things stuck on to it because Congress wanted to spend too much money. Now, this President is vetoing a continuing resolution because the Congress, in his view, is not spending enough money.

This Congress is different. It is the first Republican majority Congress in 40 years; and if our mandate is nothing else, it is to make sure that we change this pattern of endless deficits. The President's plan, finally having agreed to a balanced budget in principle, would have a deficit of $200 billion in the year 2005. We want to bring these deficits to an end, and that is the task at hand. Let us agree to the principle of a balanced budget and do it now.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Louisiana have only one remaining speaker?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the reasonable consensus of getting on with the American people's business, I ask my colleagues not to delay a vote on any continuing resolution so that the Congress can move forward on behalf of the American people. I will vote no on any delaying vote on the continuing resolution. The Congress needs to vote for a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Members can make their debating points on any bill they want except this one. The fact is that there will be 20,000 people a day who will apply for Social Security assistance. That means about 40 in each congressional district. There will be about 3,000 veterans who will apply for help on any given day, about 6 in each district. Those may seem like small numbers, but they are not small to the people involved.

We ought to get on with our business, stop the debating points. That is why I will, whenever I can today, offer a motion for a clean CR, whether it is 1 month or 1 day, whatever the powers that be in this House will allow, so that we do not wind up hurting innocent people while we continue to debate other issues that should be settled on other legislation in other places.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support my request of the Speaker that he allow for a clean CR for whatever length of time that the Speaker would be happy to entertain.

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

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that with respect to the question of the Medicare premiums that have been talked about a lot here on this floor today, my friend from California, Mr. THOMAS, made a remark that gained some attention. While we may not all characterize either the President's actions or the Democratic minority's actions the way the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] did, I think it is worth pointing out that Robert Reischauer, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, when the Democrats were in the majority, is quoted in today's Wall Street Journal as saying, ''I think, in a sense, the President is defending the low ground on this question of the Medicare premium.''

Certainly I would agree with Mr. Reischauer, or Dr. Reischauer, that the President is defending the low ground on the question of the Medicare premiums. No one in his right mind would conclude that with escalating health care costs we should reduce the premium that seniors pay for that program.

I just wanted to point that out, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I think that the gentleman's comments highlight the hysteria that has been put out for press consumption over the last few days about the potential train wreck that we have heard so much about over the last few months.

We are going through this legislative process, and it is not pleasant. It is perhaps the ugliest portion of the legislative process. But the important thing to understand is that it is part of the legislative process.

I have pointed out several times to the other party that when they were in control of the House of Representatives and the other body they had 55 continuing resolutions, they had 15 separate budget confrontations. There were some work-stop instances because we could not reach an accommodation with the President, who then, at that time, was a Republican when we had Democratic-controlled Congresses. This has gone on before, and it will go on from now on.

I worry about the hysteria. I think that it is unfortunate when leaders of either side resort to language, frankly, that simply inflames the attitudes and the approaches of the press in order to win the hearts and minds of the American people.

We have heard references, Mr. Speaker, that one side said the other side wanted old people to die to solve the Social Security problem. We have heard our Members called radical extremists. The Vice President himself used the term ''terrorism.'' The President's Chief of Staff says we put a gun to the President's head, and he uttered those words only 3 days after the funeral of Prime Minister Rabin.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. These words hurt. Somebody here on the floor today talked about animals running loose in the halls or people throwing tantrums or attaching doodads to the bills like schoolyard bullies.

Look, this is the legislative process. Two bills have been passed in the last week, a continuing resolution and an effort to raise the debt ceiling. Now, if Members do not like everything included in these bills, get the votes to reverse it, but do not label it terrorist tactics by extremists.

The fact is, this is the legislative process. Both bills passed with a majority of the House and the Senate. Just as rightfully, they went to the White House, and the President exerted his privilege under the Constitution of the United States, and he vetoed them.

Now, we are kind of at an impasse, and it will take us a few days to work it out but, folks, the process will work. And if we do not resort to this fence-building and all this name calling, we will come together, we will work through this process, and the nonessential Government workers, ultimately, will get back to work, and government will get back to normal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. 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 229, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 790]

YEAS—229

Allard	Bilbray	Buyer
Archer	Bilirakis	Callahan
Armey	Bliley	Calvert
Bachus	Blute	Camp
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Canady
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Castle
Ballenger	Bonilla	Chabot
Barr	Bono	Chambliss
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Chenoweth
Bartlett	Bryant (TN)	Christensen
Barton	Bunn	Chrysler
Bass	Bunning	Clinger
Bateman	Burr	Coble
Bereuter	Burton	Coburn

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

NAYS—199

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

NOT VOTING—4

Fields (LA)
Tucker
Waldholtz
Yates

☐ 1448

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 119, 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 119, a clean continuing resolution through midnight tomorrow, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, and procedures 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 leaderships.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Speaker to clear such a motion. It obviously needs to be done.

ENFORCEMENT OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT AND PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS AND ACCOUNTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2621.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2621.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 179, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 791]

AYES—247

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp