V. Bryan United States Courthouse'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Federal building referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall become effective on the date of the completion of the construction of the Federal building referred to in subsection (a)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

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

Mr. Speaker, Judge Bryan is a legend in the judicial community. He was first appointed to the U.S. district court in 1947 by President Truman and in 1961 he joined the court of appeals. He is best known for his 1958 order that four African-American students be enrolled in a northern Virginia all-white junior high school. This resulted in the first desegregated school in Virginia history. This bill has broad bipartisan support having passed the other body earlier this year. A companion bill was introduced and considered by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development earlier this year wherein we heard testimony from the Honorable JIM MORAN, who is a distinguished Member from the other side.

It is fitting that Congress name this new courthouse in Alexandria VA, in Judge Bryan's honor. I urge support for this legislation.

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

□ 1415

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

Mr. Speaker, Judge Albert V. Bryan's judicial career covered 37 years. It was characterized by fairness, firmness, and thoroughness. He was admired by his colleagues for his modesty and gentleness, and nobody could forget the dry wit. Everyone greatly respected his intelligence and integrity. His landmark work, as stated by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], to support integration of public schools in Virginia, was ultimately incorporated into the historic Supreme Court decision Brown versus Board of Education.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a highly respected member of our caucus, has done yeoman's work in bringing this legislation to the floor. Without his help we may not have been having it here today.

I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] for his leadership in a lot of areas in this Congress. He is to be commended for his support of this bill, and I join the gentleman in supporting this bill, to honor the life and career of Judge Bryan by designating the new courthouse to be dedicated in Alexandria, VA, as the Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished ranking minority member of this subcommittee from Ohio, who I may also say is a good friend, and I thank him for his thoroughness and fairness as well. The gentleman is someone Judge Bryan would greatly enjoy and respect.

I want to thank my good friend as well, the very distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST]. The gentleman does a wonderful job representing his constituency, but also the interests not only under his subcommittee, but of the country, and has done the kind of terrific work, particularly in the environmental area, which is just what Judge Bryan would care about.

In his 37 years on the Federal bench, Judge Bryan built a record as a legal conservative and a strict constructionist. That is why he was able to bring about the very dramatic changes in terms of school desegregation in Virginia, because of the respect that he had earned throughout his career. He was renowned for his fairness, his firmness, and his thoroughness. As has been said, of the 322 opinions written as a Circuit Judge and the 18 opinions written as a U.S. District Judge, he was reversed in only four cases. That is a record that very, very few can equal.

His colleagues knew him as a courtly, conservative Virginia gentleman, whose personal style was low-key, modest and polite, often with a dry wit. According to his son, U.S. District Judge Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Judge Bryan, Sr., thought of the court as a jewel of the Constitution.

Following through on the jewel metaphor, the Washington Post editorial that marked the death of Judge Bryan stated:

> that those who knew the senior Judge Bryan might well add that this appraisal came from an expert who valued that gem and protected it with integrity and eloquence.

With great reverence and pride, I am very pleased to be part of something that would have mattered a great deal to him, to have his name on a Federal Courthouse. I know it matters a great deal to his family and to the community that he served.

That courthouse will open next month. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Maryland and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio can join us, if they can, and even the very distinguished staff. If they can make it, we would love to have join us. I very much appreciate this legislation going forward today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the comments made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and our distinguished chairman. I want to echo those comments as far as conservation work done by the distinguished chairman. I wanted to thank the gentleman for helping with this legislation today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when I say thank you, I do not want people to take it lightly, because it is a depth that is pretty deep, when I add my thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for his help and work on this subcommittee and this legislation. I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] for bringing this to our attention, because the gentleman from Virginia knows all too well that this Nation is better as a result of Judge Bryan. I strongly urge the support of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 965

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 965.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1626

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH) at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

BASING BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS ON MOST RECENT TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 132) affirming that budget negotiations shall be based on the most recent technical and economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office and shall achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 based on those assumptions.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 132

Whereas on November 20 the President signed legislation (Public Law 104–56) committing Congress and the President to ''enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office'';

Whereas Congress has approved legislation that achieves a balanced budget in fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office;

Whereas congressional Democrats have offered alternative budgets in the House and Senate which also achieve balance in fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office;

Whereas the commitment to enact legislation in the first session of Congress requires action now in negotiations;

Whereas the negotiations have no preconditions on levels of spending or taxation, except that the resulting budget must achieve balance by fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has updated its technical and economic assumptions following a thorough consultation with government and private experts; and

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has begun consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the current negotiations between Congress and the President shall be based on the most recent technical and economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office, and that the Congress is committed to reaching an agreement this year with the President on legislation that will achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, given the situation that we find ourselves in in the country and in the negotiations relative to the budget, this is an important resolution. It is an important resolution because I think it affirms what the intent of this House is and what the intent of the Congress is with regard to our budget. It makes it clear that this Congress is determined to have a balanced budget within 7 years, and it is going to do so based upon the honest numbers generated by the Congressional Budget Office, based upon the most recent technical and economic assumptions. That is the right course of action to take. It is the way in which this country has to move.

Why a resolution? Why do we have to do it through resolution? Well, because throughout this year we have had a situation where the administration has refused, yes, refused, to be serious about balancing the budget. Back in January of this year, the administration publicly opposed an amendment to balance the budget. In February, we found out why. In February, they submitted their budget, and we found out that it maintained deficits of $200 billion a year as far as the eye could see. In April, the administration did nothing. In May, they did nothing, despite the fact that through that period of time Congress was beginning work toward moving toward a real balanced budget.

In June, just before we brought the balanced budget conference report to the floor, the administration submitted their 10-year outline of a balanced budget. The problem was that it was not a real budget. It was a press release. But nevertheless, from that time on they have been trumpeting the fact that they have a balance budget on the table.

The other problem with that balanced budget was the numbers did not add up. They were not good numbers. They were not honest numbers. It was simply a press release.

□ 1630

Then in July and August, the administration once again did nothing. In September, they did nothing. In October, they did nothing. In November, there was no activity until we got to a crisis point with regard to a continuing resolution, whether or not the Government would continue to operate.

Then all of a sudden, the President decided that he would inject himself into the game. What he did was he signed a continuing resolution; in other words, a resolution to keep the Government running, that said that his administration was going to participate in balancing the budget by the year 2002, using honest numbers. However, when we got to the negotiations we found out that the administration really did not mean that. They started talking about 7 years meant 8 or 9 years, that the Congressional Budget Office was sometime later on, it did not really affect the negotiations up front.

Since the time that that continuing resolution committing the President to a balanced budget has been signed into law, the administration has done nothing. Now, we come down to a date when, again, the Government is shut down, the administration is concerned about getting another continuing resolution, and what they are suggesting to us is we ought to just continue this pattern of negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution says how that negotiation will take place, with real numbers.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an important resolution. It is one of not great relevance, but I will still vote for it, but it gives us an opportunity to visit a little bit about some objectives and numbers being used.

Let me first say that this discussion of honest and dishonest numbers, or by implication dishonest numbers, is simply not the case. When CBO reestimated outlays for two of the major programs, Medicare and Medicaid, they moved closer to the assumptions of OMB, not further away.

On the other hand, there are legitimate differences on projected revenues over 7 years, and the reality is in the first few years, they are relatively minor and they escalate in importance, because for the first time we are looking at 7 years rather than 5.

The reality is, within the first 3 years of revenue estimates, the estimates between CBO and OMB are virtually identical. So what we have are some disagreements of people of good intent, making relatively minor differences in judgment, but which escalate into significant numbers over a 7-year period of time. And the reality is when we get to the table, as we should have been for the last several weeks, and talk about the substance of the budget, how we structure Medicare, how we structure Medicaid, how we deal with welfare reform, do we give the store away in taxes to the affluent and wealthy in the country, as the Republicans want to do, that we could work these things out.

I personally think in the end when we have a 7-year plan adopted, it should be based on relatively conservative economic judgments. But I also think we need to look at the flow of how dollars flow. I hear my good Republican friends get so excited about these slight variations in economic estimates, which we need to talk about, but I also observe what they do with the budget to make it come in balance. They have a tax cut that explodes in costs after the first 7 years.

The features of the tax plan that favor the wealthy in this country, the actual cost starts out modestly, and then it explodes. But one of the interesting things is, the cost of this tax cut keeps growing through 2001. Then, miraculously, it dips in 2002. And then it escalates very rapidly in 2003.

Is that sound planning for a balanced budget? No, just a gimmick to hide their tax cuts for the most affluent in this country. I have seen lots of estimates of how benefits will flow under programs like Medicaid to our States, and a very interesting pattern happens when I ask my State officials what will happen.

The first 2 or 3 years, relatively little impact. Then it falls off the table. No consistent flow for reforms of Medicaid

in the 50 States in this country, but rather an accommodation maybe to the Governors, who are so enthusiastic about the Republican plan, who will all be reelected or have quit their current term of office before the harshness of their cuts take place; again, not a sensible flow of dollars, but rather designed to accommodate some of their friends in the early years and then the harshness comes later.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have lots of work to do. The only way we are going to solve it is to sit down at the negotiating table as people of good will, trying to find a rational answer, being cautious on our assumptions for the future, because to project 7 years into the future is not easy.

But we also have to make sensible judgments that flow in the long term, that do not all of a sudden call for the drastic cuts in the last year or two, or tax cuts that escalate in cost beyond the 7 years of this budget resolution, or gimmicks in the last year that hide the true cost of the tax cut for the rich in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote ''yes,'' but let us get serious. That is what counts.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DELAY], and say what counts is the vote.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding me this time. I would just say to the distinguished ranking member that all of that can happen if the President would just honor his commitment, and that is the reason for this resolution, is to restate what the President put into law and has yet to honor. So I rise in support of this resolution and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

The American people are watching us today, and they are not amused. They want the President to stop his political posturing and get down to the business of balancing the budget now. The stock market has already expressed its desire to see us negotiate a balanced budget, and what happens on Wall Street has a very direct impact on what happens on Main Street.

Today, Wall Street expressed its doubts about the administration's sincerity on a balanced budget. The markets have seen the President veto the first balanced budget in 26 years. They saw him veto two sending bills just today and keep the Government closed.

The lesson is very clear: The price of failure is too high. This vote today is simply one more way to reassure the American people that we will not back down. We are resolute on our promise to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the President has waited long enough to start shopping about his ideas. He has flown across the world making peace in different countries. Now it is time for him to make peace with the Congress. Support his resolution and send a message to the President that we are serious about balancing the budget. Support this resolution and show the American people that the Congress can work together in a bipartisan fashion to balance the budget now.

Let us deliver the children of this Nation a Christmas present they can really use, a balanced budget, using honest numbers.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. CBO numbers, OMB numbers. Listen, as far as the American people are concerned, if Bill Clinton can keep the deficit coming down the way he did each year of his administration thus far, he could use Sesame Street numbers.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5¾ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to balance the Federal budget. If possible, they prefer that we do it in 7 years, but that is not the question here today. What the American people do not want us to do is slash Medicare. They have made that abundantly clear. They do not want us to abolish Medicaid, and they do not want us to cut nursing home care.

What they do not want is for us to cut education and to eliminate funds for our environment, but that is exactly what the Republican budget does, and that is why about 75 percent of the American people oppose it.

The American people know that these cuts are not being made to balance the budget or to reduce the deficit; they are being made for one reason and one reason only, to pay for tax breaks, 50 percent of which go the wealthiest people, the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America today.

Now, the Treasury Department did a study. Nearly 50 percent of their tax breaks go to people making over $100,000 a year or more. Under the Republican plan, if you are family earning $350,000 a year, you get a tax cut of about $8,500. If you are family earning $30,000 a year, you get a tax increase of about $381. In fact, under this plan, some big corporations may not have to pay any taxes at all.

Now, to pay for it, their budget makes deep cuts in Medicare, in Medicaid, in education, and in the environment. That is what this debate is all about. We Democrats believe that you can balance the budget in 7 years without making these deep cuts, and we have offered a plan to do just that, because we know that the cuts being proposed in this Republican budget will have a devastating, a devastating, effect on working families.

Do not take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Listen to what Consumer Union says. These are the people that put out Consumer Reports. You read about them when you want to buy a washing machine. You want to buy an automobile, you get Consumer Reports, buy a TV. These people put out a report. Consumer Union is a highly respected company. Listen to what they have to say in their latest study.

''What Congress isn't telling you is families of nursing home residents may face financial ruin under the Federal Medicaid bill.'' This report says if the Republican budget passes, ''36 million Americans will lose Medicaid protection they have now, and an estimated 395,000 long-term care patients are likely to lose Medicaid payments for their nursing home care next year.''

Mr. Speaker, it costs an average of about $38,000 a year for nursing home care. Where are middle-class families going to get that kind of money to pay for the care for their parents? Most families do not earn that much in a year.

Again, listen to what this report says: ''Under the Republican bill, adult children may be held financially liable for nursing home bills of their parents. Family assets, including homes, may be sold or seized to pay for nursing home bills. No one is guaranteed Medicaid nursing home eligibility as they are now. Families may be forced to spend their life savings on long-term care of a loved one, their whole life savings.'' That is what the Consumers Report says about the Republican budget, what it will do to working families.

The Washington Post today on the front page of the paper had the same article basically. They said, ''Medicaid costs may hit home. GOP plan could make families pay.''

Mr. Speaker, again, that is not Democrats talking, that is the Washington Post. That is Consumer Reports.

Mr. Speaker, we all want to get to a balanced budget, but if we get to a balanced budget by the year 2002 we have to make sure that the budget stays balanced. My friend from Minnesota has eloquently made this point time and time again: Their budget does not do that. Did you ever wonder why they keep talking about 7 years? Let me tell you why, because they do not want you to ask what happens in years 8, 9 and 10. This chart here indicates what happens in years 8, 9 and 10.

Their tax breaks explode, they go through the ceiling. They erupt in years 2003, 2004 and 2005. The red lines indicate here on this graph how they explode. What good is it to be in balance for 1 year? We work this hard to get to balance in the year 2002, and then we give it all away in the next 3 years with these exploding tax cuts.

How are they going to pay for this if they are going to give these tax cuts? If they are going to give the tax cuts, how are they going to pay to get their budget in balance? Are they going to cut more Medicare, are they going to cut more Medicaid, are they going to cut education?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have rejected this Republican budget, and the American people see through

this resolution. We can all vote for this resolution today, but it is really not worth the paper it is written on. It will not get the Government open, and it will not put people back to work. It will not get us back to the negotiating table, and it will not get us a balanced budget. We should be at the table right now talking about how we are going to save Medicare, Medicaid, and education, instead of passing meaningless resolutions that get us nowhere.

The American people want the Government to get back to work. They wanted negotiators to get back to work. They sent us here to take care of their priorities, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we should be doing that exact thing, taking care of their priorities, and their priorities are in education for the children, environment for the future, and saving Medicare and Medicaid.

□ 1645

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, This resolution simply reaffirms the commitment that was made in November by Congress and the administration that we would achieve a balanced budget not later than the year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. Those estimates are simply more conservative.

This resolution does not commit anyone to any one set of proposals or policy. Very simply, we have always stressed that everything is on the table, and that is still the same today. The only thing that is not is that we will achieve balance in 7 years, by 2002, using real numbers.

President Clinton, in February of 1993, in his State of the Union Address said, and I quote, ''I will point out that the CBO was normally more conservative in what was going to happen and closer to right than previous Presidents have been. Let us at least argue about the same set of numbers so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them.''

We have a moral reason to balance this budget by the year 2002. It is going to lower interest rates by at least a couple of percentage points, and that makes a big difference to young couples like my son and his wife who are just buying a new home. That is going to save them thousands and thousands of dollars on their mortgage.

Also, our new granddaughter, who was just born last week, is not going to have to pay $187,000 in interest just on the interest of the debt over her lifetime. It will make a big difference for all the young people in our country. So I urge everyone today to please support this resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] my good friend.

MODIFICATION TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 135 OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us could be improved if we added one paragraph at the end that stated: Further resolved that negotiations should resume immediately and continue until agreement is reached, and that during negotiations the operation of the Federal Government shall continue under continuing resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that that language be added to the resolution before us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. First of all, is it appropriate under the——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The gentleman will suspend. First, the Chair must inquire, does the gentleman from Ohio yield for the purpose of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's objection?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object to his unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain the request unless the gentleman from Ohio yields for the purpose.

Mr. WALKER Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should try to keep the Government open as we do this, and I think this would do it.

So I would urge my colleague, my friend, the chairman of the committee, to consider such language so that we can constructively get the negotiations back on track and, in fact, continue until we all reach the resolution that we want.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my good friend.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the objection just raised to the unanimous-consent request from the gentleman from Utah says everything. This document is nothing more or less than a political document. It says something that everybody can vote for, but it accomplishes absolutely nothing about what it is we are here to do.

Basically, it simply says we think we ought to balance the budget in 7 years. But it says absolutely nothing, nothing whatsoever about getting the government back to work. We have nine cabinet departments and the EPA which are now shut because the Republican Members walked out of the discussions with the President and the Democrats. That is why the Government is shut down. This will cost about $160 million to $600 million a day. We do not know exactly what the precise numbers are but that is what it is.

The hard fact is the Republicans have said this, speaking through their principal spokesman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. We will cooperate with the President to reach an agreement but we will not compromise.

How does one cooperate without compromising? The answer is it cannot be done. And the answer is this resolution does not do anything to resolve the problem of a country which is incapable of having its government function on its behalf because of the behavior of the Republican Members of this body who have, first of all, walked out of the compromise; second of all, objected to a meaningful improvement in what it is that this House would do with regard to the resolution before us; and, last of all, they are going to keep the Government shut down.

I do not know how long it is that they are going to do it but, again, Mr. GINGRICH has some interesting things to say. He says, I do not care what the price is. I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time.

Well, the Republicans want to shut this place down. They want to shut the Government down. They want to eliminate Government services and they want to pass a tawdry resolution like this which accomplishes nothing.

I would urge that the Members consider perhaps the changes made by the gentleman or that we consider the fact that this legislation is significantly lacking in that it does not say we are going to try to see to it that Medicare is protected, that Medicaid is protected, that education is protected, that the poor and the unfortunate are not going to be cast into deep and dark hardship just before Christmas.

I would observe to my colleagues that just before the holidays is a time my Republican colleagues usually choose to shut down the Government. Why they are so stricken with the holiday spirit and why they seek to do so at such time is beyond my ken, but I would again observe to my colleagues that the burden for governing this country and the burden for seeing to it that the Government runs is on the Republicans Members who have shut the Government down, who are denying the people the access to their Government agencies and denying them the working of programs which we all recognize are needed for the good of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to recognize the fault is over there. The fault is on those who are shutting this Government down and presenting us, instead, with this nonsensical piece of whimsy which accomplishes nothing in the public interest and does nothing to get the country going again.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we all want to balance the budget in 7 years or less? That is not true. We all want to balance the budget? That is not true. If we all wanted to balance the budget, it would have been balanced years ago. We have been having deficits for 30 years because everybody says they want to balance the budget, they just do not vote to balance the budget.

For the last year we have put forward a plan. We have put forward a plan the other side may not agree with, but we

have put forward a plan. And now we are waiting for theirs. Until we get their plan, it is hard to negotiate. Because we have one plan on the table, which they do not like, so they need to show us their plan.

The plan they do not like increases earned income tax-credit spending from $19 to $25 billion over 7 years. That is an increase any way we look at it, but they call it a cut. Here in Washington maybe it is a cut, but out where I live, when we go from $19 billion to $25 billion, it is an increase.

The school lunch program goes from $5 to $6.8 billion—over 7 years. Not a cut, but in this place people call it that. The student loan goes from $24 to $36 billion. It is a 50-percent increase, but the way they seem to call cuts, I guess it is a cut when it goes up 50 percent. Medicaid goes from $89 to $127; Medicare from $178 to $289 billion.

No; I am not married to balancing the budget in 7 years. I would like to do it in less. If the Democrats did not want a tax increase, that is fine. But then why did they all vote for a tax cut? If they did not want a tax cut, why did they vote for the tax cut? Why did they vote for the penalty tax elimination for seniors, if they did not want to cut taxes? They vote one way and then say something else. It gets a little tiring.

The bottom line is we have put forward a plan. We intend to move forward, however long it takes. We will do it with the President's help or we will do it without the President's help, but we have done our job. Now it is up to the Democrats to do their job.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have never been as disappointed in the President, my President, as I was this past Friday when it became clear he had reneged on his pledge to a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, a deal is a deal, a commitment is a commitment, and a law is a law. The last 30 days have been spent reinterpreting the language of the agreement that the President made to Congress and to the American people.

This resolution's sole intent is to confirm once again Congress' commitment to balancing the budget by the year 2002 using real numbers, numbers that both the Congress and the administration have agreed to use.

I join my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], in asking where is the President's plan? This is not a game of dare. In fact, it is not a game at all. It is a fundamental debate over whether this Congress will ever again have the discipline to balance its books. And what is at stake is enormously important, and that is the economic future of America. It is the future for our children and our grandchildren. Support this resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from the State of Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support for this resolution. It reaffirms what we said before that we wanted, and that is to have a balanced budget in 7 years, by the year 2002.

My colleagues might say, why do we need to do that? We voted on that a long time ago. We voted on that more than a month ago. But ever since we voted for that, the administration and the people down at the White House have been trying to move the goal post. They have been saying, well, we can come close to it or we want to use a little different figures.

This President signed a law. He signed a law saying he would negotiate. He would negotiate to balance the budget in 7 years. And that is all we are saying that we want to do here tonight. Everything else is on the table. We have said that continuously. All the other issues are on the table. The only thing not on the table is that we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002, 7 years, and we are going to do it using real numbers. No gimmicks, no games. We are going to do it using real numbers scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

Let us get on with it so that we can get people back to work, we can get the American people a balanced budget, which is what they want, by the end of this year.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, where do we stand on time here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 9¼ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend debate 5 minutes on both sides.

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

Mr. KASICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman why he would like to do that?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are a number of speakers, due to the nature of the business on the floor, who would like to have perhaps a minute to contribute to the debate.

Mr. KASICH. Is the gentleman going to be very charitable to us?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am the essence, the heart, the soul of charitable endeavors.

Mr. KASICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 month ago, the President and leaders of Congress signed a pledge to a 7-year balanced budget using honest numbers. Today, one week until Christmas, President Clinton has shut down the Government and broken his word to America's families, workers, and children.

We pledged a 7-year balanced budget for our children. We committed to preserve Medicare for our parents. And we vowed to reduce taxes for our families.

We kept our promise to present a balanced budget. We provided a 7-year balanced budget because it will benefit all Americans. Our balanced budget will reduce interest rates. More Americans will be able to afford new homes, cars, and college education. And as interest rates fall, job creation will rise. A balanced budget will mean an estimated 6.1 million new jobs over 10 years.

We kept our word to preserve Medicare and prevented it from going bankrupt. The Balanced Budget Act protects Medicare's solvency for a generation. And we kept our commitment to make Government spend less so that families can keep more of what they earn.

The same President who presented no plan to balance the budget during the 2 years when his party controlled both the White House and Congress vetoed the first balanced budget in 26 years. The same President who signed a pledge to offer a real balanced budget of his own has presented no balanced budget plan.

We must keep our word to balance the budget. Not just because we keep our promises. Balance the budget for our children, for our parents, for our country.

□ 1700

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I see one reason why this resolution is so important is because so many people say that they would like a balanced budget, but do not mean it. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], is it not interesting that when we talk about a balanced budget, we are talking about all revenues coming into the Federal Government covering all of the expenses that are going out. But still, this is such a modest proposal, and we cannot even get a modest proposal through.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to do this little bit toward getting this balanced budget now, it could be a generation before anybody is brave enough to try again.

Mr. Speaker, in this proposal of a balanced budget, even after 7 years in the year 2002, we are still borrowing

$100 billion from Social Security and the other trust funds. How deep in debt should this country go? We are spending the money that our kids and our grandkids have not even earned yet.

Let us be brave. My colleagues cannot say they want a balanced budget and then pretend to have rosy scenario scoring from somebody else, just so that they do not have to cut spending.

If we are going to achieve this goal of having fiscal responsibility and stability, and if we are going to bring interest rates down, then we have got to do it. I know it is hard. Politicians are used to doing more and more things for people, even if they have to borrow money, because when we talk about the budget, people's eyes sort of glaze over and they do not understand it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that if interest rates will go down, because we balance the budget, we are going to see this economy take off like it has never taken off before. Let us just do it. The American people want it. Everybody says they want it now. That is good news. Vote for this resolution that says use CBO scoring. Have a balanced budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution as a cosponsor of the resolution. I think that we have to recognize that numbers do matter in this debate, and it is important for us to be on the same page when we start evaluating the budget and start talking about numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly think we ought to put this issue behind us and agree to the CBO numbers, agree to the 7 years, so that we can get to the debate of Medicare, Medicaid, student loans, and the other important programs in the budget.

I think it would be the best thing we could do today for us to put this number debate to rest in the House and in the Senate, so that we could get to the important parts of this budget, and that is the public policy part of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of the Members, let us get this over with. Vote in favor of the resolution so that we can get to the serious part of this debate.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in favor of the concurrent resolution that says that we will balance the budget in 7 years, that we will use honest numbers, as the President asked of us earlier this year, the Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in particular to my colleagues that like an NBA basketball game, we are entering the final 2 minutes where all the action takes place. There are many here who work on the Hill that are interested in being with their families, none more than myself. But I want to remind all of us that from Valley Forge to Vietnam, great men and women have made serious sacrifices for our country to ensure the freedom and the future of this country for our children and for the very country itself.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for us to make what is a relatively small sacrifice; to be willing to stay here and get the job done, to balance the budget in 7 years as we have been dedicated to doing since we stepped foot on the Hill on January 4, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution as well. I believe that numbers do matter, but I also believe that priorities matter.

Mr. Speaker, we passed a continuing resolution 25 days ago. We said in that continuing resolution we would use 7 years and CBO numbers, and that we would protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment. Mr. Speaker, we should have that language in this resolution.

Also, the Speaker and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] just quoted some efforts in a press conference by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and myself, circulating a bipartisan letter that could be helpful in this. I say in my letter, Mr. Speaker, and reminding the Speaker of the House, that our letter reflected what is also not in this resolution: That the Government should remain open under a CR and that everything should be on the table, including tax cuts.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recruiting speakers, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], that kind and gentle soul. He may generate some speakers for the other side.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I take the gentleman at his word, but I happen to know he does not have Christmas in his heart.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Hawaii always has Christmas in his heart.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] as a Christmas present to my dear friend.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, am I to take it from the just-concluded remarks that I am now to deliver a short lecture on the Christmas spirit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute to make his remarks, and that of course was not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that I will be able to maintain the spirit of the discussion here on the floor. After all, Christmas is a magical time. Christmas is a time of fantasy, and inasmuch as this resolution is a fantasy and it will take magic to actually balance the budget, as opposed to the hard work that is necessary, I suppose one could be for it.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to be against it, because my reading of the Congressional Budget Office numbers are that using the honest numbers that are attributed to it is that the budget cannot be balanced by the year 2002 under the present methodology.

We might be able to accomplish it over the long term by some other method, but simply to pass this resolution to perpetuate the mythology of a balanced budget, I think, is not in our interest.

I have a letter, for example, dated December 14 from the Congressional Budget Office that the deficit in the general fund for this year will be $270 billion. So, I wish you 270 billion dollars' worth of a Merry Christmas at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I have a hard time laughing at what is going on, because there are two things lacking in this resolution. Two weeks ago, we passed a concurrent resolution that essentially kept the Government going and indicated that we would have a 7-year balanced budget based on CBO estimates, and also said that we would protect and preserve Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, and education.

Mr. Speaker, we only have the 7-year balanced budget in this resolution. We do not have the continuing resolution because the Government is shut down and we do not have the prioritization to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

I will support this resolution because I do support the 7-year balanced budget, but I do think it is wrong not to include the continuing resolution to keep the Government open. It is certainly wrong for the Republicans to not come forward with a plan that protects Medicare and Medicaid, puts money back into those programs, and eliminates the tax breaks for the wealthy in order to finance adequate funding for Medicaid and Medicare.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii underscored the experience and the warmth of the Christmas holiday season. Regardless of our religious affiliation, every single American, every single family looks forward to this time of the year to renew their relationships with friends and family to celebrate together.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is that some traditions are

very, very difficult to break, and that is what we are confronting tonight. As exalted and as precious as the Christmas tradition is for our country, we notice there are some traditions which yield only very painfully to change. The 26-year tradition of this institution calling on our children and grandchildren to pay the debts of this Government is a tradition that simply must end.

Mr. Speaker, nothing would be truly more in the Christmas spirit than allowing the next generation to escape from the liabilities of people who cannot keep their bank book.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the American public is tired of all of us precisely because of what is going on, on the floor right now. This resolution is meaningless.

Basically, the 7 years have been agreed upon and the CBO numbers are agreed upon in general. Both sides of the aisle have some smoke and mirrors in some places as we talk about CBO numbers. That needs to be cleared up. Instead of this meaningless resolution, where basically people have agreed, we need to be talking about a continuing resolution.

The Republicans will not agree to a continuing resolution to keep the Government going, to keep it operating, because essentially they are trying to do their negotiation through the resolution. They need to stop this crap and get on with the business of negotiating.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. Mr. Speaker, we have now spent almost an hour debating what is essentially a joint resolution, a statement of politics. We have essentially agreed on the policy. We all know that.

Yes, there are some differences; yes, there are allegations on both sides. But the fact of the matter is that seven appropriation bills have not been passed and signed by the President, and a third of the Government, or more, is shut down.

We could have spent this hour putting the Government back to work; not saying that we would not address the balanced budget, because my colleagues on the other side have the votes not to adjourn until we do so.

But why we have to, time after time, use as a bludgeon on this institution and the country the shutting off of services to the American public is frankly beyond me.

□ 1715

We can do it even tonight if the leadership on my colleague's side decides to do so. Pass a continuing resolution based upon the last one, which was your choice of numbers, and send it to the President, and he will sign it, and we will open the Government tomorrow and serve the American public.

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

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in my view this resolution is a colossal waste of time. I believe that a few weeks ago we voted on language that was essentially the same. This is repetitive. We voted on language that said the President and the Congress shall enact legislation the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, and the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

Now after this was enacted, our friends on the majority side say the condition for even sitting down to talk, which is what we have to do to try to reach a budget agreement, is that the President has to put down a budget that meets CBO revised in 7 years. Why is there not an equal precondition on our part to sit down, that we have a recognition of the priorities that are important to the Democratic Party, Medicare, Medicaid, environment, education, and so on?

At this rate we are never going to do other than waste time on the floor with resolutions like this. We are not going to ever sit down at a table as rational adults and begin to talk about our differences, which are fundamental. The gentleman from Ohio has said we are not making these things up. These are fundamental differences. But the only way we are going to get through it is if we can finally sit down at a table and have that conversation. We are not even going to be able to sit down unless we get rid of preconditions, your preconditions or our preconditions.

Finally, let me say that all of this worry about CBO and OMB and all the talk on this side, and I admire the work that has been done to try and balance the budget; it is hard to do. But I will just remind Members that in 1990 we had a budget summit and with the best of intentions and the best of faith on both sides, we believed, and I looked at the documents the other day, that the deficit in 1995 would be $29 billion, as measured by CBO.

We had another budget in 1993 that I know we all remember that the President brought and that all Democrats voted for that supposedly cut the deficit in half and did. So after two budgets, the first of which said that the deficit would be $29 billion in 1995, by CBO, we did not make it.

Why did we not make it? It was not because of bad faith. It was not because we did not negotiate. It was not because anybody meant for there to be a deficit of over $300 billion this year or $165 billion after the 1993 budget deal. But because there is no way to prognosticate what the deficit is going to be 7 years from now, even 5 years from now. It is humanly impossible.

So let us gather some humility about what we are doing. Let us gather some good faith about what each of us is trying to do. Let us sit down and go back to the resolution we passed 2 weeks ago, and let us look at both sides of the equation. We are not here just talking about how to balance the budget by CBO in 7 years. We got to talk about Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and whether or not we should be trying to do this with a tax break for the wealthiest Americans paid for by cuts on the poorest Americans and middle-class Americans. That is what we have to talk about.

It is going to be hard to get it done. So let us stop wasting time with resolutions like this. Let us get to the table, and let us get the job done for the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest where we are. We are voting on a resolution that reconfirms the agreement we made 27 days ago that we would have a little contract, a little contract. The gentleman from Pennsylvania understands little contract out there in Pennsylvania, he knows we make a contract. It is like going to buy a Christmas tree. You say, I will give you $12 for that tree and you deliver it to my house. The guy says, ''yes''. So you give him the $12, and then he delivers the tree.

Now, if you give him the $12 and the tree does not show up, then he is crossing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]; that would be a bad thing to do. Second, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] would never go do that, would never go and buy a tree there again because you understand the contract. We have got a point we live by; they got a point they live by.

Now, we made a contract 27 days ago. The contract was simple. We said, we will lay down a plan to balance the budget using real numbers, not cooking the books, real numbers, like a family. Whether they sit down and add up the checkbook at the end of the day after they add up the checkbook, it comes out right, using real math, not cooking the books.

We said we are going to do that, and we are going to try to recognize some priorities. I want to tell my colleagues about one of them. I want to tell my colleagues about Medicaid because this is the best part of Republican compassion.

Let me say what this is all about. The Governors of our country, the majority of them, 31 of them, they represent 70 percent plus of the American people. They say, we can figure out a way to serve the disabled, the poor, the children, the elderly. And we can do it better if you just let us have a chance to design the program the way we wanted to design it so that we can show true compassion in our States that the old one-size-fits-all philosophy is rejected. I mean, I have a shoe, it is size 6, and every foot has to fit in it. That is the way Medicaid works now.

What our Governors are saying, and, frankly, increasing numbers of Democratic Governors as well, are saying, ''Hey, Congress, stay out of this. Let us design a system that will take care and provide quality services to the poor and the disabled and the senior citizens. Do it more effectively, more compassionately.''

We met that provision in this contract. But the bottom line on the contract is a 7-year balanced budget using real numbers. The President agreed to do that 27 days ago. And we do not have it.

The Republicans have not left the table. We told the White House, you come with a real offer to get inside the box so we can have some negotiations and then we will be back. And it is not up to the Republicans. We had an amendment here that we should reopen the Government. It is the President that does not want to open the Government. It is on the President's shoulders about whether the Government opens or not because all the President has to do is live up to the contract. That is all he has to do. Put a plan down, meeting his priorities.

He can spend all the money on welfare. He can zero out the Department of Defense. He can give Hazel O'Leary three or four jets. We do not care. Just make sure the numbers add up.

Now, if we were not living up to our side of the contract, I would be embarrassed because I could not go out and I could not tell people that we were trying to keep our end of it.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, has his daughter here. Young lady, when your daddy makes a contract with you and he says, if you do this, if you make good grades in school, I am going to give you an allowance. If your daddy made that deal with you and you made good grades and he did not give you an allowance, you would be upset with him, would you not? You would be. You are right, you would be.

Let me just suggest, let me just suggest one thing, now that his daughter is here. The gentleman from Texas is a great Congressman. He is leaving. We ought to show him how much we appreciate his service in this body, with his daughter sitting right here.

Let me just suggest one or two other things. Our plan to balance the budget does not have exploding tax cuts or anything else. My colleagues in this body, our spending goes from a combined $9.5 trillion in spending over the last 7 years to a $12 trillion increase. Medicare, Medicaid, they all go up, and they all go up significantly. We show true compassion in balancing the budget and letting people have some of their own money back.

Let me tell my colleagues what this is all about. This is a message to the President. This was scripted to keep the rhetoric out. This was consulted on by Democrats in this body. Why did I insist upon It? I insisted upon it because this is not a jab in the eye of the President of the United States, but it is a message. It is a message to the President of the United States that the decent, hard-working, bipartisan membership of this body thinks that we ought to put this little girl's future first. We should balance the budget in 7 years. We should use real numbers. We can fight about our priorities.

Mr. President, this is not jabbing you in the eye. It is just saying to you, Mr. President, keep your side of the contract; and, if you will do that, we will move forward.

So what I would suggest is, for everybody, including the Democrats who totally disagree with our priorities, please come to the floor and send the message to the President to keep his side of the contract. Let us sit down and negotiate with the same set of numbers, the same set of books, with only one thing in mind: the future and the economic survival of the United States of America.

Let us pass the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 132.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic devise, and there were—yeas 351, nays 40, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 866]

YEAS—351

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—40

Abercrombie
Becerra
Borski
Clay
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Engel
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)

Martinez	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
McDermott	Rahall	Waters
Meek	Roybal-Allard	Watt (NC)
Mink	Rush	Waxman
Mollohan	Serrano	Williams
Nadler	Thompson	
Pastor	Torres	

NOT VOTING—43

Baker (LA)	Fowler	Owens
Berman	Frost	Pryce
Bilbray	Gibbons	Quillen
Bonilla	Goodlatte	Rangel
Brewster	Harman	Ros-Lehtinen
Browder	Hilliard	Schroeder
Callahan	Hunter	Stockman
Chapman	Lantos	Tejeda
Coburn	Laughlin	Towns
Cramer	Maloney	Vento
de la Garza	McDade	Yates
Dickey	McKinney	Young (AK)
Edwards	Meehan	Young (FL)
Ensign	Mfume	
Ford	Molinari	

(1751)

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Fowler and Mr. Edwards for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Messrs. FATTAH, WISE, WARD, and REED changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 866, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2539, ICC TERMINATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SHUSTER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104–422)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''ICC Termination Act of 1995''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Effective date.

TITLE I—ABOLITION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Sec. 101. Abolition.
Sec. 102. Rail provisions.
Sec. 103. Motor carrier, water carrier, and freight forwarder provisions.
Sec. 104. Miscellaneous motor carrier provisions.
Sec. 105. Creditability of annual leave for purposes of meeting minimum eligibility requirements for an immediate annuity.
Sec. 106. Pipeline carrier provisions.

TITLE II—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Sec. 201. Title 49 amendment.
Sec. 202. Reorganization.
Sec. 203. Transfer of assets and personnel.
Sec. 204. Saving provisions.
Sec. 205. References.

TITLE III—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Subtitle A—Amendments to United States Code

Sec. 301. Title 5 amendments.
Sec. 302. Title 11 amendments.
Sec. 303. Title 18 amendments.
Sec. 304. Internal Revenue Code of 1986 amendments.
Sec. 305. Title 28 amendments.
Sec. 306. Title 31 amendments.
Sec. 307. Title 39 amendments.
Sec. 308. Title 49 amendments.

Subtitle B—Other Amendments

Sec. 311. Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 amendments.
Sec. 312. Animal Welfare Act amendment.
Sec. 313. Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 amendments.
Sec. 314. Fair Credit Reporting Act amendment.
Sec. 315. Equal Credit Opportunity Act amendment.
Sec. 316. Fair Debt Collection Practices Act amendment.
Sec. 317. National Trails System Act amendments.
Sec. 318. Clayton Act amendments.
Sec. 319. Inspector General Act of 1978 amendment.
Sec. 320. Energy Policy Act of 1992 amendments.
Sec. 321. Merchant Marine Act, 1920, amendments.
Sec. 322. Railway Labor Act amendments.
Sec. 323. Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 amendments.
Sec. 324. Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act amendments.
Sec. 325. Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970 amendments.
Sec. 326. Alaska Railroad Transfer Act of 1982 amendments.
Sec. 327. Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 amendments.
Sec. 328. Milwaukee Railroad Restructuring Act amendment.
Sec. 329. Rock Island Railroad Transition and Employee Assistance Act amendments.
Sec. 330. Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 amendments.
Sec. 331. Northeast Rail Service Act of 1981 amendments.
Sec. 332. Conrail Privatization Act amendment.
Sec. 333. Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act amendments.
Sec. 334. Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994.
Sec. 335. Termination of certain maritime authority.
Sec. 336. Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993 amendments.
Sec. 337. Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 amendment.
Sec. 338. Inlands Waterway Revenue Act of 1978 amendment.
Sec. 339. Noise Control Act of 1972 amendment.
Sec. 340. Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 amendment.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Certain commercial space launch activities.
Sec. 402. Destruction of motor vehicles or motor vehicle facilities; wrecking trains.
Sec. 403. Violation of grade-crossing laws and regulations.
Sec. 404. Miscellaneous title 23 amendments.
Sec. 405. Technical amendments.
Sec. 406. Fiber drum packaging.
Sec. 407. Noncontiguous domestic trade study.
Sec. 408. Federal Highway Administration rulemaking.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1996.

TITLE I—ABOLITION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SEC. 101. ABOLITION.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is abolished.

SEC. 102. RAIL PROVISIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''SUBTITLE IV—INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

''PART A—RAIL

''CHAPTER	*Sec.*
''101. GENERAL PROVISIONS	*10101*
''105. JURISDICTION	*10501*
''107. RATES	*10701*
''109. LICENSING	*10901*
''111. OPERATIONS	*11101*
''113. FINANCE	*11301*
''115. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS	*11501*
''117. ENFORCEMENT: INVESTIGATIONS, RIGHTS, AND REMEDIES	*11701*
''119. CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES	*11901*

''PART B—MOTOR CARRIERS, WATER CARRIERS, BROKERS, AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

''CHAPTER	*Sec.*
''131. GENERAL PROVISIONS	*13101*
''133. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS	*13301*
''135. JURISDICTION	*13501*
''137. RATES AND THROUGH ROUTES	*13701*
''139. REGISTRATION	*13901*
''141. OPERATIONS OF CARRIERS	*14101*
''143. FINANCE	*14301*