Committee should identify and analyze specific magnetic levitation projects, such as a connector from New York City to its airports, the transportation project under development between Baltimore, Maryland and Washington, DC and technology transfer efforts underway in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, so that Congress can better assess how near-term magnetic levitation technology could complement other existing modes of transportation infrastructure and thereby improve the safety, speed, capacity, and longevity of current infrastructure in an era of dwindling Federal resources.

The members of the Committee that undertake the study shall serve without pay but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service. The Chairperson may appoint staff as required in undertaking the study within the monetary constraints imposed on all studies in this section. The Secretary is directed to expend not more than $200,000 on each of these studies.

TITLE IV—WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Senate bill

Title II of the Senate bill recognizes that the Federal government, as the owner of the bridge, is responsible for annual rehabilitation costs to ensure that the Bridge meets Federal safety standards. A 1994 study commissioned by the FHWA to assess the current condition of the Bridge confirmed that annual repairs fail to extend the useful life of the facility and are no longer cost-effective.

Title II provides that Congress grants consent to Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into an interstate agreement to establish the national Capital Region Interstate Transportation Authority. Upon execution of an agreement between the Secretary of Transportation and the member jurisdictions of the Authority, the bill authorizes the transfer of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge to the Authority for the purpose of owning, constructing, maintaining, and operating a bridge or tunnel or a bridge and tunnel project across the Potomac River.

Title II provides $17.5 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1996 and $80 million in contract authority for fiscal year 1997 for the rehabilitation of the bridge and the planning, design and right-of-way acquisition for a new crossing of the Potomac River. Title II also requires the Secretary to submit to Congress by May 31, 1997 a report identifying the Federal share of constructing a new crossing.

House amendment

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

Conference substitute

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with a modification to require that Congress grant approval of the agreement between the Secretary and members of the Authority prior to the Department of Transportation executing the agreement.

Ownership of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge is not conveyed to the Authority until the agreement is approved by Congress.

The agreement shall include all costs financed by the Federal government in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for planning, preliminary engineering, design and all Federal expenditures in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for replacement of the facility shall be counted towards the Federal share to be approved by Congress.

The Secretary is authorized to allocate funds from administrative expenses in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to ensure the completion of environmental studies and documentation, to provide for the rehabilitation of the existing Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge and to conduct planning, preliminary engineering and design and final engineering of a new crossing of the Potomac River.

BUD SHUSTER,
BILL CLINGER,
THOMAS E. PETRI,
BILL EMERSON,
RAY LAHOOD,
JAMES L. OBERSTAR
NICK RAHALL,
ROBERT A. BORSKI,

As additional conferees for the consideration of secs. 105 and 141 of the Senate bill, and sec. 320 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS
JOE BARTON,
JAMES GREENWOOD,
JOHN D. DINGELL,

As additional conferees for the consideration of sec. 157 of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference:

DON YOUNG,
JAMES V. HANSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN WARNER,
JOHN H. CHAFEE,
BOB SMITH,
DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
MAX BAUCUS,
D.P. MOYNIHAN,
HARRY REID,
LARRY PRESSLER,
TRENT LOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

mith,

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 270, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 122 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 122

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

TITLE I

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, H.R. 2492;

The Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

Provided, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided,* That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by both Houses as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided,* That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 and

112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1995 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1995 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995: *Provided,* That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) December 5, 1995, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, does not include funding for an ongoing project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366. For the purposes of the Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 40 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except sections 106, 111, and 112, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 115. The provisions of section 132 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1988, Public Law 100–202, shall not apply for this joint resolution. Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional $15,000,000 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for purposes of certain capital construction loan repayments pursuant to Public Law 85–451, as amended.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authority and conditions for the application of appropriations for the Office of Technology Assessment as contained in the Conference Report on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, House Report 104–212, shall be followed when applying the funding made available by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provide by this joint resolution as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authorities provided under subsection (a) of section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236) shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution, notwithstanding paragraph (3) of said subsection.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103–352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Until enactment of legislation providing funding for the entire fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, funds available for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Mines are for continuing limited health and safety and related research, materials partnerships, and minerals information activities; for mineral assessments in Alaska; and for terminating all other activities of the Bureau of Mines.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading ''International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations'' in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of sections 101, 111, and 112 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366 and multiplied further by 1.27.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Administrative Conference of the United States;

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (except that activities to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104–4 may continue);

Interstate Commerce Commission;

Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

Land and Water Conservation Fund, State Assistance; and

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Rural Abandonment Mine Program.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PARCHMENT PRINTING.

(a) WAIVER.—The provisions of sections 106 and 107 of title 1, United States Code, are waived with respect to the printing (on parchment or otherwise) of the enrollment of any of the following measures of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress presented to the President after the enactment of this joint resolution:

(1) A continuing resolution.

(2) A debt limit extension measure.

(3) A reconciliation bill.

(b) CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.—The enrollment of a measure to which subsection (a) applies shall be in such form as the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives certifies to be a true enrollment.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution:

(1) CONTINUING RESOLUTION.—The term ''continuing resolution'' means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

(2) DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION MEASURE.—The term ''debt limit extension measure'' means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) RECONCILIATION BILL.—The term ''reconciliation bill'' means a bill that is a reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III

COMMITMENT TO A SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

SEC. 301. (a) The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the One Hundred Fourth Congress to achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as scored by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

(b) The unified balanced budget in subsection (a) shall be based on the most current economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 270, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 122, 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, I yield myself 4 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this joint resolution to the floor to provide authority for most of the Government to continue operations through December 5 or until the regular bills are enacted, whichever is sooner. We have come to this point because the President has vetoed House Joint Resolution 115 and in doing so shutdown the Government. This CR will enable the Government to get back to work.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees are continuing to work on the remaining regular funding bills in a manner that will allow us to present them to the President for signature. However it is clear that many of the budget decisions will extend beyond the next few days. Therefore, we need to provide spending authority for those portions of the Government which are not covered by signed bills.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is the same as the one the President vetoed with the following exceptions:

It does not reference the energy and water development bill as it has been signed into law.

Its provisions would remain in effect until December 5 rather than December 1, giving us a little more time to do the public's business.

It does not include any provision dealing with Medicare part B premiums or breast or prostate cancer treatments or, indeed, any nonbudgetary riders.

It does, however, include a commitment to a 7-year balanced budget as scored and with the technical assumptions used by CBO. This is a commitment we freely make. This is a commitment we ask the President to make with us.

This resolution continues Government funding through December 5, or whenever a regular bill is enacted into law, whichever is sooner.

This resolution provides temporary funding for the programs covered under 10 bills. Since three bills have been signed into law, military construction, agriculture, and energy and water development, and perhaps transportation, I have just been advised that Transportation has been signed as well, those bills will have been omitted from this resolution. But you will be pleased to know that we have two other bills, Mr. Speaker, Treasury-Postal and Legislative branch, all ready for the President's signature.

All the projects and activities in the nine bills that remain operate under a restrictive formula that provides rates that do not exceed the lower of the House-passed bill, the Senate-passed bill, or the fiscal 1995 current level. The resolution provides that for programs that are proposed for termination in either the House or Senate version of the regular bill, or are significantly reduced in these bills, they may continue, but at a minimum level not to exceed 60 percent of the current rate of operations. This is down from the 90-percent level provided for in the very first continuing resolution. All programs continued will be under the fiscal year 1995 terms and conditions. These incentives will help Congress and the President keep our eyes on the big prize: that is, 13 signable spending bills, to get back on the track to a balanced budget.

This resolution continues the ''no furlough'' language that was contained in the first resolution. Early year distributions for programs that have historical high initial fund distributions are prohibited. Also no new initiatives can be started under this bill.

There are additional items that are under this resolution. They deal with hand enrollment for various future bills and commitment to a 7-year balanced budget. This continuing resolution keeps the Government functioning while locking all of us firmly into the commitment that we have championed, and that is a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join with me in voting for a continuing resolution with five main principles:

First, it provides funding at levels that are below the section 602 allocation provided for in the budget resolution. This keeps us on the glide path to get us to a balanced budget by 2002.

Second, it prevents costly Government furloughs and premature program terminations.

Third, it does not prejudice funding decisions for the remainder of the appropriations bills, except for a limited number of program terminations that are agreed to by the President.

Fourth, it continues a climate that is an incentive for all involved to conclude action on the regular appropriations bills.

Finally, it commits all of us—House, Senate, and President—to a balanced budget in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is a good-faith effort to get the Government operating again. We're moving the remaining bills as fast as we can, and we are making real progress, but we still need this CR. It is tough love, but we need tough love to keep the necessary pressure on both the Congress and the President to work out our differences on the remaining regular bills and get them enacted into law.

□ 2145

I urge all of our Members to support this joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker this is one of those issues where, frankly, I am tempted in a variety of ways in how I should react because there are things within this resolution I agree with.

My advice to the administration has been for a period of time that their goal should be to have a 7-year balanced budget, that they should also use

the more cautious and conservative economic assumptions of CBO, that a variety of other differences need to be looked at. Neither CBO nor OMB have divine wisdom, and one needs to examine those.

On the other hand, I also am going to vote ''no'' tonight in the strong belief that this is the wrong thing to do at this point in time. What we should be doing is simply passing a clean continuing resolution to deal with the reality that we have not passed our appropriation bills. Then the majority should pass their reconciliation bill, I assume, on Friday. It will be vetoed, and then we should get on with serious negotiations.

Part of this is posturing. The rhetoric gets very hot around here, and if it were not for the fact that people were not working, I think the whole institution would be better off if everybody went home for a while and cooled off and calmed things down and then get back to work. It is getting increasing polarized.

While I believe that we should move to a balanced budget in 7 years, using cautious economic assumptions, I also read today, I think accurately quoted, the leader, not of this body but of another institution involved in these negotiations, that there were four pillars to the Republican program. One was a 7-year balanced budget; the second was Medicare reform, and I am sure he meant his version of Medicare reform; welfare reform, and I am sure he meant his version of welfare reform; and a tax cut, and he meant his version of a tax cut. And those were nonnegotiable demands.

This is one of those four pillars, and to pretend tonight that somehow we take up one of those pillars, that we are taking up one of those pillars when those three other pillars still exist in the minds of most of the majority, would be dreadfully wrong. Because, in my judgment, that tax cut is not justified. In my judgment, you cannot have a fair balanced budget with the size and scope of the tax cut proposed by the majority. In my judgment, any tax cut should wait until we balance the Federal budget, not now.

Welfare reform, as passed by the majority, and I hate using this word, but, in my judgment, is mean. And the Medicare reform is of such nature that it puts too great a burden on millions of low-income widows in this country, and the scope of the change is such that it simply is not sustainable.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote this evening.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for this House to send a message. It is a message, frankly, that at the end of the day the American people will send themselves. Now we can send a message from this side, and we are going to vote, I would believe unanimously, on our side to send a message about one single thing, one simple thing, balance the budget, do it in 7 years.

Two years ago on Monday, my friend, Tim Penny, and I joined together in a bipartisan effort to send a message. It was a similar message. You know what the message was? We need to cut some spending. And I will tell you something, even though we lost the vote on the House floor that day, that message did not just get sent downtown but it got sent around the country.

I am asking my Democrat friends and colleagues who believe in the concept of 7 years to step up to the plate tonight, to join with your Republican colleagues and let us send a message, and it is not a message that is strident.

The simple fact of the matter is, under any plan to balance the budget over the next 7 years, this Federal Government will spend $3 trillion more than what we spent in the last 7 years. The question is: Are we capable of saving that extra trillion dollars for the next generation?

We are not fighting over the first $3 trillion. We are fighting over the last $1 trillion. Frankly, folks, to do this in 7 years, to let the Federal spending go up even though it goes up at a slower rate, it will help us to balance the budget. The drop in interest rates, short term, will make housing, cars, and education affordable, and in the long run it will guarantee the young people of this country will have decent jobs and decent homes and decent automobiles. That is what we are talking about.

If we fail, well, I know my Democratic colleagues and friends who voted on Penny-Kasich will not let us fail.

I told Leon Panetta yesterday in the meeting:

> Leon, just commit to 7 years. We can negotiate the priorities. We can argue what ought to be emphasized. We can get down. We can sit down, and we can have meaningful negotiations. But we cannot have them without a reasonable bottom line, and that reasonable bottom line is committing today, right now, this minute, to a 7-year plan to rein the Federal spending and save the next generation.

Let us send a strong message, not just downtown, but let us send a strong bipartisan message from one end of this Nation to the other that this Congress is serious, and we will work together to balance this budget and guarantee the children of the next generation a bright and prosperous America, a bright and prosperous future.

Support the resolution.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my Republican colleagues for having come part of the way to getting this problem resolved part of the way. You have got a further way to go. But you are moving in the right direction, and I appreciate that, and I am sure the American public appreciates that.

I am glad you have given up on the direct assault on the Medicare beneficiaries.

Now, I am going to vote against this resolution tonight because I do not put as much faith in the so-called nonpartisan Committee on the Budget staff as perhaps some of my friends over there on the other side of the aisle do. I had a lot more faith in it when they were on our payroll. I do not have quite as much faith in them when on their payroll. I think all of you can understand that.

Two, I believe that we ought to balance the budget, but my priorities are different than yours. My priorities are not to give a tax cut until the budget is actually balanced, and then if we have anything left over, we can talk about cutting taxes. And I will leave out all of my rhetoric about how terrible I think the priorities are in that tax cut bill.

But I do not want to see us have that tax cut bill on the table, because if you do keep that on the table, you are going to have to cut Medicare far too far, and you are going to have to cut Medicaid and the welfare programs far too far if you keep that tax cut bill on the table.

So the tax cut bill has got to go, and we have got to have some give in the Medicare changes, and we have got to have real give in the Medicaid changes and in the welfare changes.

The Medicare changes and the Medicaid changes and the welfare changes are really hard and cruel. And I do not think that you all are hard and cruel, but I do not think you really understand what the problem is. You are cutting more money out of poor kids than you really are cutting out of Medicare. You are making huge cuts in the welfare budget.

Seventy percent of all the people in America who are on welfare are children, infants and children, and you are taking food out of their mouths, you are taking medical care away from them, you are taking housing and shelter and everything else away from these children. That is not fair.

I am sure when you focus on that, you will come to that same conclusion. So take the tax cut off the table. Take the Medicare cuts off the table. Take the welfare cuts off the table that you have given them, and take the Medicaid cuts off the table.

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

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, this is it. This is the moment of truth.

We had a continuing resolution just a few days ago on this floor. The President vetoed that. He said he could not

sign it because the language keeping Medicare premiums at 31 percent of Part B was unacceptable. He said he could not countenance keeping Medicare premiums at their current level.

I think he is wrong. We have to do it to protect, to preserve Medicare. We will come back. We will revisit that issue on the Balanced Budget Act before this week is out.

What we have here tonight is a clean continuing resolution to reopen the Government. There is no extraneous provision, no add-ons here.

Oh, yes, yes, it does say we will balance the budget in 7 years, and, yes, it says the President will agree to work with us to accomplish that. But surely that is no problem. The President has already said we can do that. He said it not once, not twice, but repeatedly. President Clinton has said we can balance the budget in 7 years.

In fact, he said he would submit a budget that would do it in 5 years, and that is all this resolution says. It does not say we will have tax cuts or Medicare reform or welfare reform, nor does it say what their shape would be. I think we should have them. I think we should have all of those things. But this continuing resolution does not commit the President to any of those.

□ 2200

This stopgap spending bill would put Federal workers back on the job. It says we will work together to balance the budget in 7 years. If the President vetoes this, we will know it was not Medicare that caused the first veto. The truth will be out there for all to see, stark, bare naked.

This President will be saying he cannot agree to a balanced budget, not now, not in 7 years, not ever. I say to the President, there are no more excuses. There is nothing left to hide behind. Your spokesman tonight misquoted you when he said you repeatedly rejected a 7-year balanced budget. But you can set the record straight. You can demonstrate your solidarity with the American people who want a balanced budget. You can put Federal workers back on the job. You can sign this spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, the American public quite obviously wants us to be serious. I have 56,000 people who work for our Federal Government. They rely on each one of us to do our job seriously so that they can support their families and do their job on a day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month, year-to-year basis. I believe the overwhelming majority of those people give outstanding service to the American public.

I suggest to my colleagues, however, that they and America are distressed because rather than do our job totally seriously, we do what politicians like to do, send messages. Not necessarily do work, but send messages.

I listened to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], for whom I have great respect. He got up and said, let us send a message that we are for a balanced budget. I had voted for that amendment. I voted for the resolutions. I voted for the coalition budget. I believe not only in sending the message but in doing it.

My colleagues, we have here a bill. It is 16 pages in length. I suggest to my colleagues that the first 15 pages are, in fact, a relatively clean CR that would put those people who live in my district and in fact live in every district in America back to work tomorrow. The President would sign this 15 pages. That is the substantive part.

Unfortunately, for me and for others, there is a 16th page. It really does not mean anything. It has words on it. It had words about 7 years. It has words about CBO scoring. It has words about the most recent economic statistics. But you and I both know that this really does not mean anything, and we ought not to fool the American public.

We cannot, by this statute say, Mr. President, after you sign this bill tomorrow you cannot sign a bill which does something different. And we cannot say, by this bill, as all of my colleagues know, that tomorrow this Congress, after passing these 8 lines, cannot do something differently. Of course we can.

All of my colleagues know on this floor that we are about to get real. It is called substantive. Because we are going to bring to this floor a reconciliation bill. That is real. It will incorporate real policy alternatives and each of us will have to vote on those alternatives.

It is, therefore, a shame that with just 48 or 72 hours to go before we bring that bill to this floor that we have to continue to send messages, not to be real.

This is real. It says tomorrow we put the Government back to work, that contractors who are doing work for our Government and their employees will get paid.

But this is political message, political game playing. Is it not a shame?

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it is time, Mr. Speaker, to put politics behind us. It is time to get back to the people's business. It is time to put 800,000 Federal employees back to work. It is time to be there for those 60,000 elderly and disabled persons and 15,000 veterans who have already been denied benefits that they are legally entitled to because there were no Federal employees to accept their claims. It is time to open up our national treasures to the 1½ million American families who have been turned away from their national parks and monuments because they have been shut down.

My colleagues, it is time to balance our Federal budget. I personally do not think it is time to cut taxes because no business should pay out dividends when it is operating at a deficit. But the sooner we get to balance, the sooner we can reduce the American people's tax burden. Without his tax cuts, the President can reach his balanced budget objective in 7 years rather than 8 or 9 years. If, indeed, the President's higher economic forecasts are correct, then that additional revenue over and above the CBO forecast should be used to pay for the President's tax cut proposals. But first things first.

Our very first responsibility is to vote for this continuing resolution and to put America's Government back into the business of serving America's people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I voted for the coalition budget. The coalition budget says that we will balance the budget, like the American people want us to do, in 7 years. Now, what this CR says tonight, it says, we want to balance the budget in 7 years and use CBO figures. I will support the continuing resolution because that is what it says.

Now, the continuing resolution says on these parameters that we will vote to try to balance the budget in 7 years. It does not say that we are going to cut $270 billion out of Medicare. We will fight that. It does not say, we are going to cut $10 billion out of student loans. We will fight that.

It does not say anything about where things will be cut and amended and pieced together. What it does say is that the American people want us to talk, Democrats and Republicans. If we can have Bosnians and Serbs and Croats talking in Dayton, OH, we should talk. If we can have Catholics and Protestants talk in Northern Ireland, we should talk. And if we can have Mr. Rabin to talk to Mr. Arafat about a longstanding feud going back centuries, we can talk and maybe fight about where our priorities are on a balanced budget.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I do not know that I could improve on that last speech.

Mr. Speaker, I do urge my colleagues to vote for this continuing resolution which is a giant step toward certifying a balanced budget.

I just wanted to say to my good friend from Maryland, who spoke earlier, that said 15 pages of this bill are important and mean something and the 16th page means nothing. My answer to

the gentleman from Maryland, if it means nothing, he has voted for a 7-year balanced budget. He ought to be able to vote for this continuing resolution.

Two-thirds of this House came here to balance the budget. I know some of my colleagues would rather not send this CR to the President. Some of my friends would rather keep the heat on the President and let him keep the government closed. And let me say to my colleagues, that choice does hold a little appeal to me. It would be nice to have the President come to the negotiating table rather than just make speeches that are misleading at best.

But I think we have an opportunity to clarify where President Clinton stands on a balanced budget. And that is worth its weight in gold.

After all, President Clinton has more stands than the Houston Astrodome when it comes to the balanced budget. The question today is simple: Will the President support a real, certified 7-year balanced budget or will he continue to evade and confuse this issue that is so important to the American people?

Yesterday President Clinton said, let us say yes to a balanced budget and no to the cuts. The President really means yes to a balanced budget but only if it happens by magic.

Well, the President needs to know that a balanced budget only happens through hard work, hard choices and very real cuts in spending. So I say to my colleagues that the country wins if we pass this CR, no matter what the President does. Because if he votes this CR, the American people finally know that President Clinton oppose a real balanced budget. But if he signs the bill, we have the real numbers from which we can negotiate a real agreement. I just urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put President Clinton on the spot. Vote for this CR and let us clarify where the President really stands on a balanced budget.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution were just about balancing the budget over the next 7 years, I would vote for it. But it is not, and I will not.

Several speakers from both sides have talked about the fact this is a clean resolution. Without editorial comment, let me simply state the facts. This resolution does more than that. On an annualized basis, it cuts veterans health care benefits by a half a billion dollars. Let me repeat that. On an annualized basis, it cuts veterans health care benefits by $500 million. This is not the first continuing resolution.

I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, there are veterans in hospitals around this country who have served their nation who would probably take greater umbrage at the facts in this resolution than some of the Members who helped write it who object to the fact that I have stated the facts about this resolution.

Let me also say that this is not a clean resolution on other matters, on many issues that most Democrats had no input on. Let me list some of the cuts, programs that will be cut by 40 percent. And let each Member decide whether he or she wants to support a 40-percent cut in these programs.

□ 2215

Summer youth employment, AmeriCorps, veterans homeless programs, State offices of rural health, rural health research, substance abuse training, national vaccine program, new rural health grants, Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program at a time when we have freezing weather across many parts of this Nation, rural housing, Goals 2000, State and local grants, Goals 2000 national programs, school-to-work national programs, early childhood education also along with the others cut by 40 percent, Federal Perkins loan capital contributions, State student incentive grants.

This is not a clean resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote no on it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virgina [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my Republican colleagues for stripping extraneous language from the continuing resolution as the President asked, and I applaud my colleagues on the other side who are willing to join the bipartisan dialog on how to balance the Federal budget. This continuing resolution does not mandate tax cuts, it does not mandate Medicare cuts, or education cuts. But it does get our Federal employees back to work without furloughs over the next 2½ weeks, and it does mandate that together Republicans and Democrats, the Congress and the President, will join together and work together to balance the Federal budget and do it within the CBO guidelines, something that the President stated right here that he feels was the best way, the best way really between what will work and what does not work. It does not cut the veterans benefits; basically, without furloughs, funds these agencies over these next 2½ weeks, and it leaves off Medicare, it leaves off cuts in education and the environment, which was ostensibly the reason the President gave for vetoing the last resolution.

This gives the President what he wants, and it commits us to doing what we came here to do, and that is balance the Federal budget.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me. I want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us the time. I want to thank the Republican leadership for bringing forward a better CR than we saw heretofore, and I want to say that I speak for some Democrats who believe that we can balance the budget in 7 years and are prepared to support the CR tonight.

But I want to say that we do not feel like we have a monopoly on wisdom and virtue and we do not think that either side here has a monopoly on wisdom and virtue. We think we ought to work together.

This CR is a step in the right direction. It balances, or calls for a balanced budget, in 7 years.

We think, if our colleagues will allow some of the minority to work with them and that if the minority will work with the majority, we think we can make an American solution, not a Republican or Democrat solution, to the problems that face us all as Americans. If this country goes under, it is not going to be just the Republicans or the Democrats going broke. It is going to be all of us, and we ought to set aside some of this partisan rhetoric that I hear from both sides, quite frankly, and try to get together here while we are here in the short time that we serve in public life and do something for the people that sent us here.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

There is nothing in this continuing resolution about how we will balance the budget. It merely says that we will do it. The words are:

> The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the 104th Congress to achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the year 2002 as scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The President's response when he was asked the following question by Dan Rather, ''Are you saying flat out that you will veto a clean bill that contains only in it the insistence to balance the budget?''; the President's response was, ''Yes, I cannot tell you how strongly I feel that this would not be good for America. I do not believe in it.''

The difference between the President and the Congress has finally been exquisitely clarified and perfectly defined. This is the people's House. The people will speak tonight through the Congress. Let us pass this resolution. Let us balance the budget in 7 years.

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

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking to the Republicans because they are together. They have gotten their program together, and they are coordinated. I am speaking to my colleagues in the Democratic Party:

> I love each of you very, very much. I want to say to you this is a time for you to stand

up, and be counted, and it's not time for you to go vacillating and running all over the globe. It is time that you say we stand for something, we support our President.

Now do not let anybody be fooled. There is no way in God's Earth that they can balance this budget by doing $245 billion worth of tax cuts. There is no way it can be done. If they do it, my colleagues know they got to take it out of someone's hide. They are going to take it from the poor, from the elderly, and from the disabled.

Now look at it. I do not care how smart my colleagues are mathematically or what kind of statistician they are. There is just to no way that can be done.

Now let us get back down to bare facts. All of my colleagues have come up here. I have watched them. They want more from Medicare, they want more for the older people, they want more for Medicaid, and they are not saying too much about Medicare. I say, ''Think about it. You're talking about the environment. If you're any kind of environmentalist, then vote against this continuing resolution. There is no way you can do it. Face it.''

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to fish or cut bait. My colleagues have got to cut bait now; the fishing is over.

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuing resolution and the commitment to a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, for years the Supreme Court has wrestled with the definition of the word obscene. They have not succeeded, but we here have. It is obscene to have a national debt approaching $5 trillion, a national debt which requires us to spend nearly $900 million every day just in interest payments—that doesn't feed anybody, or clothe anybody, or educate anybody, or provide jobs or medical care for anybody—it just services the national debt. That is obscene.

This is an historic moment. We now have the opportunity to demonstrate, in tangible form by our vote, that we not only heard the American people and their message of November 8, 1994, we are heeding it.

The American people said, in unmistakable terms, that they want smaller, less costly, less intrusive and yet more efficient government. That's a tall order, but we can do it.

In this 104th Congress, with a new majority determined to respond to the will of the American people, we have demonstrated that we are keeping the faith. In this House we have passed a balanced budget amendment, we have passed a line item veto, we have passed welfare reform and we have been both responsive and responsible in moving to avert a crisis of monumental proportions by passing legislation to save Medicare. I proudly voted for these significant measures, but our job is not done.

We must move to fulfill our commitment to the American people and our children and generations to come by approving this resolution which moves us ahead on our journey to a balanced budget, a balanced budget to be achieved on a date certain not decades away, but in seven years. When we have done what we must, we will be able to say a day's work well done.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the words of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK]. This is indeed the time to stand up and be counted. Indeed this is not a debate about airplane trips, or education, or EPA, or veterans, or Medicare, or whether the national parks will be open or closed. This is a debate about whether or not we should pass a continuing resolution that is going to open this Government up, end the shutdown, and at the same time affirm the vote that 300 Republicans and Democrats cast earlier this year to have a balanced budget in 7 years and save this country.

For my two little children, Jonathan and Lucy, and all the other children in this country in whose hands the future of this country will lie long after we are all gone, please join me in supporting this resolution tonight.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this continuing resolution tonight, I think it is important to look at the components of the budget negotiations that we are actually in the middle of. The majority would ask us tonight to support a balanced budget by the year 2002 using Congressional Budget Office budget assumptions. Sixty-eight of us, myself included, have voted for a plan that accomplishes exactly that. But there is a third and essential leg to this three-legged stool that is conspicuously missing in the continuing resolution advanced by the majority tonight, and that is the $245 billion tax cut. There is not one word about backing off of the $245 billion tax cut in this continuing resolution.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose it tonight because we know that advancing towards the goal of a balanced budget in 2002, which I support, CBO numbers, which I think are sound, cannot be accomplished with the $245 billion tax cut without eviscerating cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, farm programs, student loans, and the rest of the litany of horrors represented in the budget reconciliation act, including the raid on pension funds that notwithstanding a 94-to-5 vote in the Senate has come back into the Budget Reconciliation Act in the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are at this point in the budget negotiations because the Republican majority has insisted upon increasing the part B premium for Medicare as part of passing a continuing resolution. Tonight they back off of that, but they insist on two points: balanced budget by 2002, CBO numbers, and not 1 inch of budging off of their 245 billion tax cut disproportionately benefiting the wealthiest people in this country. We now that means cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in farm programs that cannot be sustained, and we must vote no.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 2230

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the American people are shouting about the shutdown of the Federal Government. Some are shouting that we are scared, we are not sure how we are going to pay the rent, we are not sure how we are going to buy groceries, and they have a right to be scared.

But a lot of people are shouting some other things. Here is a message. I have a stack of faxes. ''We are 60 years old, close down the government as long as it takes, continue with Medicare reform.''

Another message: ''The Republicans are on the right track. Stay the course. We have come a long way. We've got a long way to go.''

Another one. ''Hold the line.''

Another one. ''Balance the budget.''

Another one. ''Just do it.''

The message is very clear. Overwhelmingly, my constituents are saying, ''Stay the course. We want a balance budget.'' We have to resolve this issue.

Tonight we are offering a solution. We are saying we will get back to work and we will move to balance the budget. I hope that the President is listening to the American people. We are, and we are determined to solve the solution. We are bringing it to his door today.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this measure has been called a sham, a shame, but in short, it is nothing but a Medicare cut under another name. Our Republican colleagues were so committed to cutting Medicare that the one thing they sent over to the President, along with their proposal, was an increase in Medicare premiums. They got caught. The American people have been saying no, and they have been saying no all week to that kind of Medicare cut. So what are they coming back with tonight? They come back with a new straitjacket to accomplish through the back door what they could not get done through the front door.

There is one thing this great revolution that they have provided us has not changed. That is elementary school arithmetic. Adding still is the same old way as it was prior to the last election. If you give hundreds of billions of dollars of tax cuts to those at the top of the economic ladder, you give the Pentagon $8 billion more than it asked for,

the only other place you can look is to take it out of the hide of the senior citizens of this country, out of the schoolchildren, and out of the environment. That is what they are going to do through this resolution. If you believe in protecting Medicare, you are going to vote against this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with a flabbergasted expression of surprise, I am not happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

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

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

I stand tonight in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, now is the time. The Nation is asking us to put partisanship aside and unite as a Nation on behalf of this very responsible blueprint that builds for a better tomorrow. On behalf of my child, Abbie, and my son, Ted, and all the children of America, it is time to embrace as a Nation this blueprint. I ask the protectors of the old order here in Washington to put it aside.

Let us move forward, with the President and the Congress united, let us go forward in this blueprint that takes care of the future for our children, creates jobs for the future, hope and opportunity for all Americans. It is time to unite and pass the continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I come to you this evening before this body as a strong supporter of a balanced budget, a strong supporter of a balanced budget in 7 years. I challenge the Republicans to give us a balanced budget within 7 years. Stop this ancillary nonsense of cutting every program out there. You go out and you cut programs that provide for youth employment, you cut the programs for veteran's homeless benefits, you cut programs that look out for the Native Americans, for AIDS education, for rural housing, for substance abuse, for low-income energy assistance, the Christa McAuliffe scholarship fund, all of the Eisenhower leadership grants, and the star schools programs.

You sit there and cut those programs with grins on your faces, and yet you are willing to provide an enormous tax cut to the wealthy, you are willing to cut the Medicare Program, you sit there, two-faced, pretending to the American people that you are for a balanced budget when the only thing you are for is gutting the poor, hurting the low-income people, hurting the senior citizens, and lining the pockets of the wealthy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from asking unanimous consent for the gentleman to proceed for another hour, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial that appeared today in the Mobile Press Register.

NATION'S FUTURE AT STAKE IN BUDGET SHOWDOWN

It finally happened. President Clinton and the Congress were eyeball to eyeball, neither blinked, and the government shutdown was under way. On its first full day, more than a few Americans shared radio commentator Paul Harvey's attitude: ''The government has shut down. Enjoy it while you can.'' In reality, though, this Beltway tug of war is no laughing matter.

If it isn't resolved quickly, the man on the street may conclude that neither the Clinton White House nor the GOP-led Congress cares nearly as much about the future of the country as they do about the upcoming elections. In the case of Bill Clinton, who tracks opinion polls like a dog following a juicy steak, the man on the street would be correct.

Over in the House, though, one-third of the Republicans were elected for the first time in the 1994 GOP landslide. They believe passionately that they were sent to Washington to carry out the will of the voters. Their constituents want them to downsize government, fix welfare, restore Medicare to solid footing, balance the budget and eradicate deficit spending—and they intend to do it.

They're the ones who are refusing to get drawn into politics as usual, who aren't willing to be bullied by poll numbers or even the threat of losing their Republican majority in 1996.

This budgetary clash of the titans erupted Monday over two normally routine measures. One was a bill that would have raised the national debt limit so the government could borrow money to pay its bills. The other was a measure to fund the government temporarily while Congress kept working on the regular appropriations bill.

The president vetoed the emergency measures because Republicans insisted he sign onto their goal of balancing the budget in seven years. That should have surprised no one; Mr. Clinton is always weak when he should be strong, and inflexible when he should be willing to negotiate.

How can he fail to recognize that this is no mere political struggle? What the president and Congress do now about balancing the budget will define the scope and the nature of our government well into the 21st century. This is a rare chance to step off the deficit treadmill. Results would include lower interest rates, increased investment and a dynamic economy for years to come.

Without action on Washington's part, before the year 2000 we will be spending more each year on the national debt than we spend on national defense. Yet Mr. Clinton stands stubborn, declaring that he'll protect Americans from the GOP's ''unwise cuts'' in Medicare, Medicaid, education and environmental protection.

Whenever genuine balanced-budget advocates talk about reining in government spending, this president accuses Republicans of ''slashing'' social programs. Such shameless rhetoric is obviously intended to rouse public ire and obscure the real issues.

Republican leaders are doing the nation a service by holding out for a presidential commitment to a balanced budget. Mr. Clinton is doing the nation a disservice by his blatant attempts to fuel public hysteria.

White House spokesman Mike McCurry said Tuesday that his boss is ''willing to give up his presidency'' rather than accept the GOP's priorities. That's nice to know; but if Bill Clinton blows this opportunity for government to turn itself around, his ''willingness'' to relinquish the presidency in 1996 will be academic.

A year from now, voters will take care of that for him.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I represent Hope, Arkansas, and Hot Springs, Arkansas. I represent where the President has grown up, where he has forged out his political career, where he has gotten votes from citizens in my district from years and years and years.

I want Members to know I am in favor of this balanced budget, because those people at home are crying out for that to happen. They want the President to know that it is not a question of who we are taking money away from as far as the poor and the people who are dependent on government, it is who they are taking away from before they get to that point.

The President knows that. He is from our district. He knows that. They are saying, almost unanimously, with every letter, every call I get, ''Balance the budget. Do not get fooled.'' I am saying the same thing. I would like for us to respect the people who earn the money and balance the budget for their sake, rather than the people who are receiving the money from the government.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House can say that I have routinely and blindly defended the President of the United States. If you doubt that, all you have to do is take a look at the newspapers this morning. But having said that, I want to stand here and defend him from some of the things that I have heard this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this debate, unfortunately, is not being driven by policy. It is, in my judgment, being driven by sheer, raw power politics. There is no question that the Speaker has been planning for a long time for this moment. All you have to do is to go back to his quotations in April and May, where he made quite clear that he was just waiting for the time that he could load up a debt ceiling or a CR and send

it to the President, and he made quite clear on numerous occasions that he did not care what the price was.

He made that clear as recently, I believe, as yesterday. I don't care what price political parties pay, or what people pay on this House floor, but I do care about the price that our system pays when the public concludes that what we are doing is driven by raw politics and raw personal ambition. And yet that is what the public has concluded on the basis of this sorry episode.

We are in this position because this Congress has not finished its work. We are in this position because over 90 percent of the appropriations still have not become law, and that has given the Speaker an opportunity to try to leverage his position by sending down to the President a series of poison pills.

First, he sent down to the President the CR which the President vetoed because that contained the poison pill that required Medicare premiums to be virtually doubled over the next few years. The President vetoed that. The majority party took a big public relations bath for that effort.

Now you are in the process of trying to send a second poison pill down to the White House. That poison pill is to demand that the President, sight unseen, with no understanding of what underlying assumptions there are. Except for CBO's technical and economic assumptions, it demands that, sight unseen, he buy into the idea of a 7 years balanced budget.

Let me tell you why I am suspicious of that timetable. Because I have been here long enough to see three previous promises broken in terms of multiyear budgets. This chart shows the contrast between the promises that Ronald Reagan told us, that he would balance the budget in 4 years, versus, in the red bars, the performance. He promised that in 4 years we would hit a zero deficit. They missed by $185 billion.

Then we were told, ''Well, let's try Gramm-Rudman.'' Again, they promised in 5 years we would get to a balanced budget. They only missed by $220 billion.

Then they tried Gramm-Rudman II, and again, they promised that they would take us down to zero deficit. They only missed by $290 billion. So I think we have a lot of reasons to be suspicious of these political promises about multiyear balanced budgets.

Nonetheless, nonetheless, I am willing to support that idea, provided we know what your other assumptions are. That is why the recommit motion, which I will offer tonight, would have us accept this proposition, provided that you buy some of our assumptions.

Our assumptions would be:

First, no tax cut shall be provided until the budget is in balance;

Second, no reduction should be made in education which closed the door of opportunity to young people;

Third, no alterations in the Medicare program should restrict the access or quality of care available to senior citizens, or disproportionately increase the cost of that care to those citizens;

Fourth, no money may be appropriated, and no targeted tax benefits will be provided, including all fiscal 1996 appropriation measures and the reconciliation bill you are about to produce, if they are not subjected to a line-item veto which the President can exercise to hold us to that 7-year timetable.

□ 2245

You want us to buy your technical assumptions on CBO. I will be happy to buy them, but we want to know that in the process you are not going to gut social security, you are not going to gut Medicare, you are not going to gut education, you are not going to provide a tax cut, a huge percentage of which goes to the highest income people in this country.

We want to know in short order that your economic prescription for reaching that balance is not going to fall disproportionately on the shoulders of working people so that once again the richest one-half million families in this country can clean up on the gravy train as they have done by your policies for the last 12 years. You buy our assumptions, we will buy yours.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

You know, 435 Members of this body claim in principle to accept the balanced budget, and every break we go back to the Kiwanis Clubs and Lions Clubs, and we tell the Rotary Club we want a balanced budget. ''Of course, I support it.''

I call this Rotary Club speech versus reality. Tonight you have a chance to make that vote. There is nothing to squirm about in this. It is just a clean bill. Very simple. Do you want a balanced budget in 7 years or not? Do you want to get the furloughed employees back to work or not? Do you want to leave the gates of old faithful open or not? Do you want the social security services and passport services to be reopened or not? That is what we are debating.

We are not debating Medicare. We are not debating welfare reform. We are not debating taxes. We know you all love taxes as much as you seem to disdain the middle class.

But this is only a bedrock, fundamental question. Statement in principal: Do you want a balanced budget in 7 years or not?

You know, the previous speaker said that our Speaker, the Speaker of the House, had been waiting for this for months. Well, I will tell you what, 234 Members on this side of the aisle have been waiting for this, and so have the American people. Let us balance the budget and let us do it tonight.

Let us vote for this bill.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who usually takes the floor on things like this. I usually like to reserve to bills that I have direct jurisdiction.

But I am alarmed tonight at what I am hearing, the restoration of the partisanship on both sides, in fact, that does not really fit tonight.

We have been criticized by the media, by the American people, because we have been partisan. The last week in Terre Haute I was criticized because I said there was ample responsibility and blame for both sides of the aisle here in not achieving this continuing resolution.

Now, I am going to be critical of you on the Democratic side. I am about as least partisan as anyone here and still claim to be a loyal Republican. But you asked for a clean CR. I am surprised that this is as clean as it is, with one exception, the provision that we have almost all of us voted for that we will support to balance the budget by the year 2002. That is all this says, that we are reestablishing.

Tonight, support this. If the President does not sign it, then I will say the blame is all one way. And I am sorry to say that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing tonight, talking about the poison. The poison, Mr. Speaker, is the $5 trillion debt. The antidote is a balance budget.

The President said on no less than six occasions, in fact, a balanced budget is something he wants. Well, all of America is waiting for it.

This legislation is bipartisan. A balanced budget, according to Alan Greenspan, will reduce mortgage payments, reduce car payments, reduce college payments, reduce health care costs.

This is the best legislation for seniors, for children, working families. This bill is good for America.

I ask all Members to vote for it. It is good for America.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

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

Mr. Speaker, men and women and children of America, listen up, look into the eyes of this Chamber, listen to the words in this Chamber, for tonight for the very first time in the entire 11 months of this 104th historic Congress, the issue is crystal-clear. The issue is crystal-clear, as it will go down to Pennsylvania Avenue. This issue is crystal-clear, as it will go over tomorrow to the U.S. Senate. Does this body join the American people in support of

a balanced budget or do they not? Is the President going to stand by what he said over and over again, or is he not?

He will have that chance. America has that chance. This is America's night. This is America's day. Stand up and say we will balance the budget and make sure that the folks on both sides are accountable for that, and, most importantly, men and women of America, make sure the gentleman at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue hears that message. Call, write, fax: ''We want a balanced budget amendment, we want a balanced budget.'' This is the vehicle to do it.

Let us commit ourselves as America has committed us to do and vote for this continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair wishes to inform the Members that all remarks should be address to the Speaker, not to other Members or to those outside the Chamber.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, let me see if I get this right: If we vote for the alternative proposal being offered tonight, then we are basically admitting that we are willing to cut, or we are willing to meet the balanced budget? We just do not want to change our spending any? That is a joke. I think we all know that. I think the American people know that, that there really is only one way to balance the budget, and that is to reduce the rate of growth and to stop spending as past Congresses have done.

Why are we doing this? We talked about poison pills. We have talked about a system, protecting a system.

Well, let me tell you, you cannot go home and hug a system. I can go home and hug my four children. This is for them. This is for the future of our children.

The balanced budget means the very lives and future of every one of those children just as it is for my children. Put up or shut up. Come on, you have got the opportunity to do so. Quit squawking, get the job done.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in favor of this clean continuing resolution to balance the budget and, as a matter of fact, to let Government start operating again.

I also rise on behalf of 800,000 Federal workers who have been furloughed. These men and women are frightened, anxious, and confused. Through no fault of their own, they find that they no longer can work. Even though they have been assured that there will be an appropriation for them in the future, they want to work. They want to continue research on the AIDS virus. They do not want to stop looking for better educational strategies for our children. They do not want to stop developing alternative energy sources. And they want a balanced budget.

To me, this is so very simple. There is no requirement in balancing this budget, the commitment the President has made and will make with this continuing resolution, that says he has to have tax cuts in it. There is no commitment that he has to follow any of the suggestions that have been made by the majority side. He simply has to show he can balance it in 7 years using the CBO figures.

We must do that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need to balance the budget. But, what is getting lost in the budget debates and the shutdown posturing is the fact that Federal workers are human beings—they are taxpayers; and they are consumers. They have kids off in college. They buy food at the local grocery and worship at the neighborhood churches and synagogues.

These public servants also want a balanced budget and believe in a future for their children—the common vision that we all share, even though there are different roads to get there.

I've been assured by the leadership that action will be put forth that would pay Federal workers for any time off resulting from this shutdown, and I am sure the President will agree with this. And I'm grateful for this commitment, but Federal workers do not want something for nothing. They want to work. They don't want to stop research on the AIDS virus; they don't want to stop looking for better educational strategies for our children; and they don't want to stop developing alternative energy sources. And they want a balanced budget.

Shutdowns are inconsistent with the principles that bring people to Federal service. They are contrary to good government management and an affront to the taxpayers who must foot the shutdown bill.

Mr. Speaker, we all look bad on this—from the President to the most junior Member of Congress. I hope we learn a valuable lesson from this experience, because I never want to come to this floor again to speak about a Federal shutdown.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this continuing resolution, and I reach out my hand in thanks to the many Members of the other side who are going to join us in supporting this continuing resolution and making it a bipartisan bill going back to the President

Frankly, I am stunned that before we had even taken action this evening, the President took it upon himself to say that he would veto legislation that is going to have strong bipartisan support that would reopen the government and, most importantly, establish the principle that 300 of us on both sides of the aisle voted for, and that is to balance the budget in this country for the first time in 33 years.

I urge my colleagues to support this continuing resolution on both sides of the aisle. Let us send this to the President and let him know that we want to see a balanced budget for the first time in this country in over 25 years.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill that is good for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of our constituents have been wondering what this whole government shutdown crisis is all about. Contrary to the characterizations by some in the media and elsewhere, this is not a petty, partisan, pushing match between a Republican Congress, and a Democrat President over who is tougher or stronger.

This is a very serious debate over the future size, shape, role, and direction of this Federal Government.

It is about our commitment to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years.

It is about downsizing and streamlining the Federal bureaucracy.

It is about returning more responsibility and, tax dollars to the States, localities, and most importantly, to the people.

It is really all about the first three words of the Constitution, ''We the People.'' The people want a balanced budget.

The people want a trimmed down Federal bureaucracy.

The people want us to cut waste fraud and abuse from Government.

The people want us to re-think, re-set, and, yes, reduce our Federal priorities, because they recognize that when the Federal Government tries to do everything for the people, it usually fails to do much of anything successfully, other than collecting the people's hard-earned tax dollars.

That is what this dispute between the President and the Congress is all about. We have invited the President to join with us in our task of bringing the Federal budget into balance by fiscal year 2002.

The President has thus far balked at our invitation on grounds that he doesn't want to give up his priorities and programs. He would still like to have the American people believe that we can not only continue with all we are now doing (and spending) but that we can even do and spend more, not less, and still balance the budget at some time after he has long left office.

Mr. Speaker, that is a recipe for disaster. The Federal Government is not what will save our Nation and its economy. It is our ability through the private sector to create new and better jobs and opportunities for today's workers and their children.

The Federal Government is not our salvation. But it is what is standing in the way of this country's salvation, as long as the Government continues to spend us deeper and deeper into debt, and consume the capital that is so desperately needed to re-build this country and its economy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the differences between this Congress and the president are not petty, partisan squabbling, by any means.

They are a very fundamental debate about the future direction and scope of this Government, and what it will or will not allow the people (by their individual and collective enterprise and efforts) to do to save this great Nation of ours.

And balancing our Government's books, in a reasonable amount of time, in a carefully measured way, is critical to the success of "We the People" to save ourselves by our private sector initiatives and efforts.

Let's vote for this bill that will permit the Government to function at a reduced rate of spending, while we hammer-out the final details of that 7-year balanced budget bill, that will put us on that steady glide-path of digging this Nation out of its debts, and putting it back on a glide-path of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like very quickly to say that this should not be a partisan vote tonight. This is a question of whether or not we are going to balance the budget of this country within 7 years. It is about the economic future of this country. It is not about a tax cut. There is no tax cut in this bill.

It is not about Medicare. Medicare is not in this bill.

It is not about a Republican or a Democrat agenda. It is simply about common sense: Do we want to leave the country that we received from our parents, do we want to leave that quality of life and economic future to our kids?

Tonight, before each one of us casts our vote, close your eyes for just a second, think about your kids, your grandkids. Think about the generations to come after us. Do we want them to have what we had? Or do we want to leave them a bankrupt Nation?

Think about it tonight. This is the only question that we should really consider: Do we want to live within our means and leave a better country for our children than we have today?

□ 2300

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding 1 minute to me, and wish it were 1 hour.

I rise tonight to ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to please vote for this bill, this CR. I think it is not that complicated. We are trying to put our Federal workers back to work. We are simply saying that we need to balance our budget, and Members all know that.

My colleagues have all said they wanted to do that in a 7-year period. I am asking my colleagues to help us balance this budget for my children and my grandchildren, for the 80 percent of the American people who believe we need to balance it, for the 66 percent of the people in my district who voted for me who sent me here to balance it, but maybe most of all for one Federal employee who left a note in my office the other night. I would like to read it to my colleagues and share it with them and ask them to consider voting for us.

The note read,

> Congressman Norwood, please don't give an inch to Clinton. I work in the AC shop and I met you the other night. I have a wife and 5 children and stand to lose $531 this week from furlough days. I support Newt and yourself and all others for the current balanced budget. The only Christmas we may have is this bill, but I can't think of a better Christmas.
>
> Please support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this bill. We are here tonight because we have not gotten our work done. We are on a continuing resolution because the appropriation bills have not been done on time.

I respect greatly the work that has gone into this budget. I respect the legitimate intentions of the Members in the majority that have worked on this. But we have expended a tremendous amount of energy in the last days simply trying to extend the government, extend the debt so that we could have the time to do either the presentation of bills to the President so that we could bring this to a successful conclusion or to get the veto from the President, which is certain to come, so that we could get to the negotiations, if that is what is to happen next, so that we again can bring this to a successful conclusion.

We are expending energy needlessly on a continuing resolution tonight that includes admonitions about the budget in a bill that is not the budget. We know that there are many Members in the body, Democrats and Republicans, that want to reach a balanced budget in 7 years. This bill does not do it. The bill tomorrow or Friday is the bill that does that. And we cannot quite seem to get to the main act.

Now, let me say to my friends, if this is to be successful at the end of the day, at some point there has to be a willingness in the majority to say that there have to be 100 minority Members who are part of voting for this budget so the President will ultimately sign it. For the good of the country, I would hope that we could get to that point. But many on the majority side have said over and over again, well, the only way this works, the only way we will be for it is if there are 218 Republican votes for the bill. And in fact, some have said we will never be for a budget that gets as much as 100 Democratic votes. If that is the ultimate outcome, I think then we are bound to argue these issues into the campaign.

I am not unwilling to do that. In fact, I have come to believe that these issues are of such importance over such a long period of time that the American people should be dealt into these decisions, if the decisions are simply yours alone. So at some point there has got to be a coming together.

Let me finally say this: I understand the Speaker said today, reported in a news article, and sometimes those news articles are wrong and I understand that, but he said that the 7-year number was intuition. I respect his intuition. I respect anybody's intuition. But I am here to tell my colleagues that this issue of 7 years is a clash of values. A budget is not just about 7 years. A budget is about a lot of different decisions.

I am here to tell my colleagues tonight, like a lot of people among the American people, I am not for balancing the budget in 5 or 6 or 7 or even 8 years, if it means decimating and ruining the Medicare program that the people of this country have come to depend upon. I am not for balancing the budget in 6 or 7 or 8 years if it means that the young people in my district and in your district cannot get a student loan when they need a student loan to get their education. I can tell my colleagues for sure that I am not for a balanced budget if it means that we are going to cut Medicare and Medicaid and cut seniors, if we are using the majority of that money to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest people in this country.

So I say to my friends on the Democratic side tonight, vote against this bill. Let us not put bookends on this decision that says that it has got to be my way or the highway. Let us decide in a rational way, either through the presentation of bills or through an honest negotiation between the parties for a good, sensible, logical, humane balanced budget for this country, even if it takes 8 years or 9 years. Let us not lock our hands tonight and say there is only one way to do this. There has got to be a number of ways to do it. Let us work together to get it done sensibly.

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

Mr. Speaker, the lines are clearly drawn. The other side wanted a clean bill. This is a clean bill with one exception. It says all we want to do is achieve a unified balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 based on the most current economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. That is the difference in this bill from the bill that they have been saying they wanted from the beginning, and all this one does is commit us to a balanced budget.

On behalf of all the Americans who want the Federal budget balanced and on behalf of all Americans who want their government working and fully functioning, I would urge all our Members, Republican and Democrat alike,

to pass a clean continuing resolution that will commit us to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, finally the choice has been made clear: whether the Congress and then the President are committed to a balanced budget or not. The question is not 7 years, or whether there will be a tax cut or not, or whether Medicare and Medicaid will be reformed. The question is solely whether the Congress is committed to balancing the budget in 7 years or not, and then whether the President has such a commitment.

The issue is really whether business in Washington will continue as usual or whether there will be a new commitment to change. To change from policies that have left our children in major cities uneducated, or welfare system supporting persons in the third and fourth generations, our population plagued with drugs, our prisons overflowing with people who do not obey our laws.

Change has come to the private sector in America, and while the transition in the post-cold-war world has been difficult, our country today is in position to successfully compete throughout the world. We have known that it was necessary to change how we organized and conducted or business enterprises, to reduce inventories, to lay off unproductive and unneeded employees, to do those things to meet competitive pressures in the world economy. We have turned the corner and today are as competitive as we have ever been, with an economy characterized by both low inflation and low unemployment.

But change in the private sector is not enough. Everyone understands that government must change as well. That 40 years of accumulating programs to serve narrow constituencies at high administative costs can no longer be afforded. That huge deficits year after year, draining the future from our children and grandchildren, cannot be tolerated. That all the rights we are guaranteed as a free people in this most free land on earth come with responsibilities—the responsibility to give something to our country, to contribute to solving its problems.

It's time, Mr. Speaker, that we start from the premise that we are all Americans, that we must change business as usual, stop demanding that our interests as seniors, or business people, or union members, or farmers, or of any group come first, and that we find the way to work together to solve our country's problems. We must begin by a commitment to balance the budget and put ourselves on a solid economic foundation that will guarantee our children and grandchildren the opportunity for a better economic life.

This resolution does that. It puts the Government back to work for the American people and commits the Congress and the President to balancing the budget. There is no escape for the President, nor for any Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker. You're either for balancing the budget or against it. There's no question of how, or what spending cuts will or will not be made or whether tax cuts are or are not part of it. It's only a commitment to do the job. Yes or no. How will you be counted?

□ 2310

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 270, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Clerk, read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 122 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that it report back the joint resolution to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 9, line 12, strike ''40 percent'' and insert ''10 percent''; and,

Amend Title III by striking the last period and inserting the following: ''and shall be based on the following substantive assumptions

(1) tax cuts shall be provided only after the budget is in balance;

(2) no reductions in education shall be made which close the doors of opportunity to young people;

(3) no alterations in the Medicare program shall restrict the access or quality of care available to senior citizens or disproportionately increase the cost of that care to those citizens; and

(4) no money will be appropriated and no targeted tax benefit will be provided (including all fiscal year 1996 appropriation measures and any reconciliation bill enacted after the date of enactment of this joint resolution) that is not subject to a line item veto in order to maintain the time table for a balanced budget.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what this motion to recommit says is that we will be happy to buy into the idea of a 7-year balanced budget despite all of the blindfolds that that implies provided that the majority party will be willing to buy into the following requirements: First of all, that a tax cut will be provided only after the budget is in balance. We do not want any $14,000 tax cuts going to people making $300,000 a year before the budget is balanced. I do not want them anytime.

We also do not want any reductions in education which will close the doors of opportunity for young people. I thought the reason we came here was to open doors of opportunity, not close them.

Mr. Speaker, we also do not want to see tax cuts that are provided by cuts in Medicare and cuts in Medicaid, and we do not want cuts in those programs to affect the quality of care or disproportionately increase the cost of that care to the citizens who rely on those programs.

Lastly, we want the line-item veto to apply to each and every appropriation bill that passes for this fiscal year, we want it to apply to every item in the reconciliation bill that passes, and we also want it to apply to all of the tax goodies that from time to time work their way into bills in this place, especially for rich friends. We want the President to be able, if he indeed is expected to adhere to a timetable of 7 years, we want the President to have all of those tools available, and we want them available now.

Now everybody talks about personal experiences. I held a lot of hearings in my district over the past months, and the person I will never forget is a young woman who was 22 or 23 from Rhinelander, WI, who appeared at a hearing of mine. She had two young children. She divorced her husband because he beat the hell out of her on a regular basis, and she needed Medicaid desperately, she needed to maintain her student loan, she was homeless for 4 months last year, and yet she kept going to school each and every day because she wanted to make something of herself.

I do not want to balance the budget on the backs of people like that when at the same time in the reconciliation package coming down at us on that freight train we are going to be asked to make life a whole lot easier for the wealthiest people in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely nothing against rich people. I want everybody to be rich. But in the 1980's, in the 1980's, we saw the richest one-half million families in this country increase their share of national wealth from 24 percent to 32 percent. Think about it. At the same time we saw the average working person in this country either hang on or lose ground.

We want to change that. We do not want to see the budget balanced in a way which increases the disparity—in income and well-being—between the very wealthiest people in this society and the folks, the everyday folks, who struggle every day just to make ends meet.

If we are going to listen to the accountants who tell us how we numerically pull the numbers together, we also want to listen to the folks who will talk to us about the morality associated with these choices so that we also pay attention to the need to hold this society together. And we will not hold this society together if we continue to follow a prescription which asks as its first question, ''What can we do for the boys on the top?'' We will not hold this society together if we wind up with a prescription that gives table scraps to everybody else in this society, and that is what has been happening for the last 12 to 15 years.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution if the motion to recommit is not adopted.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, in favor of the continuing resolution, and I yield the 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very historic debate, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding this time to me.

The Mobile Press-Register had it right today when they ran an editorial entitled ''Nation's Future at Stake in Budget Slowdown,'' and that is what this is really all about.

I listened carefully twice this evening to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished leader of the Democrats on the Committee on Appropriations. I really liked his one chart about how past efforts had failed. He did not note that he was part of the majority in Congress during those failures and that we are different. We have been here 11 months, and we are different, and we recognize that, and we accept it.

As my colleagues know, this does not need to be a fight.

□ 2320

Virtually every liberal who opposed the balanced budget earlier this year said, ''We don't need a constitutional amendment. We need the courage to make the decisions now.'' You go back and read the RECORD. Virtually every liberal said, ''Vote no on the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. We can do it here.'' And they are right. And we are.

Just last week, 68 Democrats voted for a 7-year balanced budget. Let us be very clear, the language tonight says nothing about taxes. It says nothing about defense. It says nothing about education or environment. All it says, all it says the President of the United States, in return for us giving him billions of dollars to spend, should commit to a 7-year balanced budget, scored honestly, by the Congressional Budget Office.

Everything is on the table. You want to negotiate over the taxes? Fine. Let us negotiate. We believe that a $500 tax credit per child for a working mother with three children is a good thing. That is $1,500 in her pocket when she goes to work. But that is not in this resolution. That is to be negotiated. All this resolution says is ''Use the Congressional Budget Office.''

Now, I was here in the minority, I sat right there where the gentleman from California is sitting, in the Whip's chair, and I watched the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, right there is his first speech to the Congress. And he said to us: ''We should score all of these things with the Congressional Budget Office.'' He said it. Why? Because historically it was more honest, it was more accurate, and it was not under the political control of the President.

So all we have done is take the President's advice. Now, there is one constant misrepresentation I just have to take a moment to comment on. It is in the statement of administration policy sent out. And it saddens me. It was in the quotes from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], from my good friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. Here is what the administration says: ''Drastic cuts in Medicare.''

Let me say to my friends, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] talked about ''gutting Medicare.'' The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] talked about ''simply arithmetic.'' Let me give you the actual facts, and I am not asking all my Democratic friends to agree to this. That would be on the table to be negotiated. But I at least have to make the record clear.

This year we spend $4,800 per senior citizen. At the end of 7 years in our plan to balance the budget and save the Medicare trust fund from going broke, we spend $6,700 per senior citizen. That is just an arithmetical fact. That is just true. You may not like it, maybe you want to spend more, but that is an increase per senior citizen of $1,900, per year per senior citizen, more than the inflation rate, more than the medical inflation rate. In fact the total growth in this program, which is 45 percent, is twice the inflation rate.

When people say the word ''cut,'' it is just not accurate. I really wish they would have somebody on their staff do the arithmetic; from $4,800 to $6,700 is an increase.

But let me come back to what is really happening. The President wants money. We need to get the furloughed employees back to work. That is the right thing to do. We want the Federal Government to work at full speed. That is the right thing to do. But the President, since April, when I first said we would not accept a veto strategy, we would not allow ourselves to be stopped by the power of the veto, the President simply refused to negotiate, and as recently as tonight he has said he does not want to get to a balanced budget in 7 years. He wants a lot more money, a lot bigger deficit, a lot higher taxes.

We have a document right down the hall called the Magna Carta. It is a reproduction from England of the original, created in 1215, when the barons said to King John, ''You can't have money unless the people who are taxed have some say.'' In America that got translated pretty simply: No taxation without representation.

Then we created the Congress based on the House of Commons, the House over here. The Senate was supposed to be the House of Lords, and I will not comment, out of a sense of comity. But the power to originate all taxes and the power to originate all spending is in the legislative branch.

Why? So that the 435 people elected every 2 years from back home, and the 100 Senators elected to represent the States, would have the power to say to a President: ''If you want money from the American people, there are legitimate, honorable conditions.''

And tonight we only say we want one condition, and it is not a hard condition. Almost 90 percent of the American people want this condition. Our phones are ringing off the hook with people who are saying, ''Don't back down. Don't give in.'' What is that condition? Balance the budget. And how long do we take? I say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, you are right. Seven is an intuitive number. It is based on having spent 35 years studying this business and trying to figure out what is the shortest time without causing immense pain that we could get to a balanced budget.

I would say that the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, has done a brilliant job in working that out, and I would say that 68 of your own colleagues voted last week to 7 years because it is doable in 7 years. Why should we take a year longer than necessary?

So all I say to all my friends on both sides of the aisle, we do not ask you to agree on tax cuts, we do not ask you to agree to a number in defense, we do not ask you to agree to a number in education, we do not ask you to agree to anything but two principles, that the budget shall be balanced in 7 years and that the scoring will be honest numbers based on the Congressional Budget Office.

We say to the President, ''We offer you a contract with the representatives of the American people. We will give you the money to bring back the furloughed employees. You sign on the line that you agree to work to a balanced budget.'' It is that simple. It is that direct. It is that American.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I support balancing the Federal budget within 7 years. It can be done if we roll up our sleeves and work in a bipartisan fashion.

However, I am not able to support this evening's continuing resolution as it fails to provide even the most basic protections for Social Security or Medicare. Further, it would immediately cut education, veterans' homeless programs, and—at the outset of winter—the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

This is not a vote taken in a vacuum. The House has adopted a balanced budget that calls for $270 billion in Medicare cuts. I cannot and I will not support the weakening of Medicare for our seniors.

I am prepared tonight to work across the aisle to balance the budget. My priorities for cutting the Federal budget include slashing military spending, agricultural subsidies, the space program, and Federal agency overhead, as well as eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

I will work with anyone to bring the Federal budget under control, but I cannot support tonight's partisan effort.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 241, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 801]

AYES—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
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
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
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
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
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
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
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—241

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
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
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
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
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
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
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—5

Fields (LA)
Houghton
Tucker
Waldholtz
Yates

□ 2344

Mr. RAHALL and Mr. QUINN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 151, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 802]

AYES—277

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
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
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner

Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—151

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Shadegg
Skaggs
Slaughter
Souder
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Fields (LA)
Houghton
Tucker
Waldholtz
Yates

□ 0004

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 707

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 707.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit on today, Thursday, November 16, 1995, while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

The Committee on Commerce;

The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities;

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight;

The Committee on House Oversight;

The Committee on International Relations;

The Committee on Resources;

The Committee on Science;

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and

The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–346) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 O'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0110

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHRYSLER) at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 15, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. THOMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLIARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIXON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EHRLICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes each day, today and November 16.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, on November 16.

Mr. BARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANFORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LONGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to: