

NOT VOTING—27

Berman	Klug	Quillen
Boucher	LaFalce	Shuster
Buyer	Lewis (CA)	Studds
Cox	Martinez	Thomas
Dickey	McHugh	Thornton
Dingell	McIntosh	Torrice
Fields (LA)	Owens	Tucker
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Kaptur	Pickett	Weldon (PA)

□ 1212

Mr. MILLER of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 783, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1215

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, and procedures recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope it is soon cleared, because that is what we need to do to avoid the Government shutting down on Monday.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the resolution on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of

agreeing to House Resolution 261, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 182, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 784]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—182

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Bonior
Ackerman	Becerra	Borski
Andrews	Beilenson	Browder
Baesler	Bentsen	Brown (CA)
Baldacci	Bevill	Brown (FL)
Barcia	Bishop	Brown (OH)

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

NOT VOTING—27

Berman	Kaptur	Quillen
Boucher	Klug	Shuster
Buyer	LaFalce	Studds
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Thornton
Dingell	Martinez	Tiahrt
Fields (LA)	McHugh	Torrice
Ford	Owens	Tucker
Hancock	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Johnston	Pickett	Weldon (PA)

□ 1224

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1963

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1963, and to delete my name from subsequent references and printings of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 262, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the Senate amendment is considered as having been read.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 34, strike out line 1 and all that follows over to and including line 17 on page 251.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Senate considered and passed H.R. 2586, a temporary increase in the Government's borrowing authority, approving all of the provisions in the House bill that we sent over, except for the proposal eliminating the Commerce Department.

The bill now contains the most crucial pieces that we approved yesterday: a downpayment on a balanced budget, a brighter future for our children, and the protection of Social Security and other Federal benefit trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, these protections are essential, because the Treasury Department right now is planning to raid the civil service trust fund as a circuit breaker to avoid breaching the debt limit. But this circuit breaker is really a high voltage wire that directly taps into retiree trust funds.

In time, the administration may be even tempted to raid the Social Security trust fund if, in fact, the President continues to stall and does not come to a resolution of the debt problem with this Congress.

Currently, the law does not protect the Social Security trust fund, but the provisions in this bill do. The provisions prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from ever raiding the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, the administration may veto this bill, but the steps it takes to get around the legal limits on borrowing will be closely watched. If assets are taken from the funds, we will know it and we stand ready to protect retiree and other benefits.

This short-term extension is intended to provide the administration with the opportunity to have an orderly man-

agement of the debt until December 12, and opportunity for the President to join with us in negotiating a balanced budget bill.

Such a bill will include a permanent increase in the debt ceiling to accommodate the provisions of that bill. However, for the moment, we need to keep the pressure on the administration if we are to bring the differing views together and resolve this problem.

The time for delay is passed. No more excuses. We must stop passing our generation's debt on to our children and our grandchildren. We must face facts and bring our budget into balance.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, in this bill, December 12 is the drop-dead date for the President to come to the table and negotiate in good faith on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years by CBO numbers, and without tax increases.

We are committed to do no less. It is our responsibility to our children and it has the support of 82 percent of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to protect the trust funds and vote to press on with the fight to balance the budget.

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of fancy language and a lot of fancy arguments, but let me try at the beginning to explain what is going on. This debate today should never have taken place, had the Republican leadership had any ability to lead. The voters gave them a majority in this House of Representatives, a substantial majority. We just saw it on the last vote.

We are not delaying anything here. We are not postponing anything. This is just their inability to work in the Republican Party with themselves and get their act together and get legislation passed. They should have done this back in July. This is November 10.

Why have they been so long? Well, you will have to judge for yourself on that.

The piece of legislation we are actually debating here today and will vote on soon is still a piece of blackmail. It is an attempt to lure and to force the President to come and adopt their rather radical agenda, and he refuses to do so. It is an agenda that gives tax cuts to the very wealthy who have neither asked for them nor need them. It is an agenda that places the burden of balancing the budget on the sick, the aged, the children of America, the working poor, those least able to defend themselves or to support the sacrifices that need to be made to balance this budget.

The Republican Party's priorities are simply wrong. The President recognizes that. In addition to that, there had been no leadership from the Repub-

lican Party to get the regular business of this House conducted. Here we are, a month and a half after the end of the last fiscal year. We have not passed the appropriations bills that are necessary to run this Government. Only three of the bills have ever left this Chamber and left the Senate and headed for the President's desk. There are nine more floating around out there in limbo somewhere on which the Republicans are fighting amongst themselves about the bill. We do not control the vote. They have got the votes. The American people put them in charge, and that trust has been severely violated by ineptness.

So I regret that the bill that is here today and is the subject of the next vote is just another attempt to blackmail the President to come bargain with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE, and yet they have not presented their own appropriations bills. They have not presented their own budget which they are still arguing over amongst themselves, and they are trying to place the blame on us.

Mr. Speaker, that is the simple truth of all that is going on here today. Members are going to hear a lot of fancy rhetoric about saving the trust funds. Baloney. They know that is baloney. The only reason anybody has to raid the trust funds is to keep this Government from collapsing, from not paying its honest debts. That is all that is at stake today.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from now are the debt junkies who for 40 years ran up trillions of dollars worth of debt and gave us the situation that we are now in and now are out complaining about the process. It is fascinating. They not only ran up trillions of dollars worth of debt, but they were the junkies that adopted what was called the Gephardt rule so that they put the entire debt of the United States on automatic pilot. So, anytime we had to have more debt, we simply passed and kind of deemed the debt to have been passed under the Gephardt rule.

These debt junkies would not even bring bills like this to the floor because they did not want to go through the agony of raising debt, and the debt swelled by trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars. And then what did we get from them? We got excuses: It is not our fault. Ronald Reagan made us do it.

Now the excuses today on the floor: Oh my goodness, the process does not work the way we would like it to work. And so we now have a new excuse.

Then when all the excuses were gone and when people began to recognize they were debt junkies, then what happened is they turned to gimmicks. You

have the Secretary of the Treasury out doing the PR gimmick here for several weeks trying to scare the markets. When that did not work, now what they have got is their newest gimmick. Their newest gimmick is to actually raid the trust funds, to raid the retirement trust funds of the United States, including as a potential the Social Security trust funds.

The gentleman from Florida tells us that is not what is happening. Well, USA Today does not agree. In fact, USA Today this morning runs a headline that says, retirement accounts could be tapped to avert default. So it is very clear that the news media, the American people, everyone is now understanding that, if we do not pass this bill in the form we bring it here today, we are putting in jeopardy the trust fund accounts of the United States, that the Democrats, because they are debt junkies, are perfectly willing.

Vote no more excuses, no more gimmicks. Pass this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a question. That is, has any Democrat proffered putting the Istook amendment, for instance, on the CR? We know that is the reason the CR is held up. What Democrat had anything to do with that? This is a fight between Republicans, not us.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might want to check the CR when it comes out here later on. The Istook amendment will not be on it.

Mr. SCHUMER. The RECORD will show that that is what has held it up. That is the reason we are here. I am glad that side has shown some leadership to tell the gentleman from Oklahoma he should not be holding this up.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body a number of years. I thought I had learned a few truisms. I thought there were certain things I could rely on. One of them was that this country never, never should default, that our debt is money spent, money owed, that the full faith and credit of the United States was involved.

Yet this morning I read in some of the papers the financiers of Wall Street are saying it really is not going to be catastrophic if we default. These statements absolutely perplex me. Do these financiers think that the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, would never default, so they can make these statements? Are these financiers trying to ingratiate themselves to the leadership of this House?

I do not know what they are trying to do. I only can say to these individ-

uals, men and women on Wall Street, you have the investments in your hands, pension funds and mutual funds. You should know better than to say default is not going to be catastrophic.

I stand here right now and say this House should be doing one thing, passing a clean debt ceiling. In the meantime, we could hammer out a budget that could get 218 votes.

This Member would be perfectly willing and there are other Democratic Members who would join with Republican Members for a clean debt ceiling, and this should happen. Let us be clear. We are going to have a budget, and we are going to raise the debt ceiling. But I do caution those people who should know better. We should not even talk about default, let alone play about it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Senate-passed debt ceiling extension. While I strongly support the Senate's action in dropping elimination of the Commerce Department, this bill is still overburdened with unrelated matters.

What the House should be doing today is passing a clean temporary debt ceiling as an interim measure to prevent default while a balanced budget agreement can be hammered out.

While it may be true that the majority cannot, in fact, pass a debt ceiling without conditions or riders, no one should lose sight of the fact that many Democrats, including this Member, would support a clean extension simply because the cost of default is too high. And the President has said he would sign one. Yesterday six former Treasury Secretaries sent a letter to the Speaker and Senate Majority Leader DOLE asking for a clean debt ceiling.

When all is said and done, the debt ceiling will be increased. We shouldn't hold the economy or average American families hostage to a partisan debate on a balanced budget. We should enact an extension in the debt ceiling immediately.

Let's be clear, raising the debt ceiling has nothing to do with the current level of Government spending, and everything to do with financing our prior obligations—living up to our commitments. There is no doubt that the debt ceiling will be raised in the long run. Let's stop playing games and pass a bipartisan clean debt ceiling.

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

The gentlewoman has spoken to exactly what the bill is about, to permit the orderly management of the debt until December 12. There is nothing in this bill that says default. What it says is that on December 12 we will have a problem if the President will not come forward, exercise leadership and negotiate with this Congress for a balanced budget in 7 years by CBO numbers without tax increases.

There is plenty of time for that to happen. The President has within his hands the ability to negotiate with us and to eliminate any possible threat of default, but he has yet to be forthcoming in this regard.

The truly important thing for the future is to get this budget balanced. Canada has its problems today because

it did not balance its budget. Sweden has its problems today because it did not balance its budget. We cannot continue to let these interest service charges creep up and up and up because they will ultimately be the culprit in default in the long run. We have plenty of opportunity to get this budget balanced, and we are determined to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a respected member of the committee.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this debt limit extension, especially in view of the strong restrictions it includes against the raid of the Social Security trust fund assets.

Three million people depend on Social Security each month to meet their basic living expenses. They paid for these benefits while they were working. They should not have to worry about whether their checks are going to be paid during a debt limit crisis or whether the assets of the trust funds will be gamed or raided in order to keep the Government running.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security trust funds held \$483 billion in assets as of September 30. That is a huge and an alluring pot of money right now in this crisis. The bill we are considering maintains public confidence in Social Security. It prevents a repeat of what happened in 1985 when the trust funds were disinvested to get around the debt limit. It makes it absolutely clear that these assets may not be used for any other purpose other than to pay Social Security benefits or related administrative costs.

The bill also makes it clear that Social Security checks will be paid to seniors on time even during a debt limit crisis when a shutdown of the Government is being threatened.

The administration claims it will not use Social Security assets to pay the bills, but the public record is littered with their zigs and zags on important public policy questions, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know better than anyone. This bill protects Social Security from disinvestment and does so on a permanent basis. The law currently does not do that. This bill preserves the social compact between generations that Social Security represents.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, there is nothing you can do that will mask what you are doing here. Nothing.

The Social Security argument is a complete sham. The gentleman was there when the Treasury Secretary assured, through his representatives, this country under no circumstances will touch Social Security. The gentleman got up here and made that argument.

It is a sham. Look, we are also talking about the debt. We could stand here and argue for hours who caused the debt. I was here during many, many sessions when we passed bills less than the Republican President asked. During the 1980's, the total amount that was spent was less than requested by Republican Presidents.

That is not what the public wants to argue about or hear about. They are impatient with you. You are playing politics with their checkbooks. You are playing brinkmanship. It is not pressure. It is a pistol you are putting to the head of the presidency. And who will suffer if you succeed, if there is default? Those who have adjustable mortgages, those who have credit card payments to make. Your extremism is already seeping into the attitudes of the public, and that is why they reject this Republican Congress. The Speaker should not blame the freshmen.

□ 1245

He is the leader of that gang. He is the pied piper. He is going to lead his troops over the edge and take our colleagues with him, but the trouble is he will take the country, and all the taxpayers and the hard-working families with him, and that is why in the end our colleagues' brinkmanship will fail. It is a miserable tactic shrouded with miserable arguments. Turn down this miserable bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, if it is extremism to meet ones financial obligations, then there are extreme people on our side of the aisle. If it is extremism to pay one's debts, then we are extremists. If it is extremism to make Government accountable and responsible, then we are extremists.

I chair the House Civil Service Committee. I have only done that for a few months, and let me tell my colleagues about the mess we inherited. As my colleagues know, we have approximately 39 Federal retirement programs, and Congress has raided every retirement cookie jar. Thirty-five of the thirty-nine Federal retirement programs are already raided. There are no funds in them. Two funds, the Federal employee retirement trust fund and the military trust fund have unfunded liability of over a trillion dollars, and that is not counted in the \$1½ trillion national debt. So now they are telling us that retirement accounts are their next avenue of irresponsibility, and that is only part of the problem. We are paying \$19.8 billion out of the Treasury to meet the current benefits for our Federal employees and another \$24 billion every year to pay the interest on the money we stole from the account. So now they found one more account, one more bastion of irresponsibility, and I tell my colleagues that we cannot continue the funny book-keeping that we have inherited.

Even the President summed it up, and that is what this debate is all about. He said it: "I taxed you too much and I cut too little." If we are going to run this country \$67 billion more in debt for 34 days and make every man, woman, and child in this country pay for those 34 days another \$269 just for that short period of time for that debt we are extending, then we should have fiscal responsibility, and we should end the ways of the past.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear. To the extent that there is any risk to our trust funds, to the extent that there is a risk as to whether we will honor our debt, to the extent that whether there is a risk as to whether we are able to continue essential services, that falls to the Republicans' failure to bring to this floor a clean extension of our debt ceiling, and let me explain the hypocrisy of the Republicans here. Their budget calls for an increase, an increase in our national debt authority of \$600 billion. They have already approved it on the House floor. They have already approved it on the Senate floor. But we have not brought to the President an agreed budget that includes that \$600 billion, so we do not have that authority here today.

Now why do we not have that \$600 billion additional authority? Because the Republicans have missed the deadline. The deadline was October 1 to get their budget passed and to the President. They missed that deadline, they missed it badly, and now we run up against the debt ceiling, and we are being asked to extend it by about one-tenth of the permanent amount that is in their budget, a little over \$60 billion, and the Republicans say, "Wait a minute. We want to put all types of conditions on that extension that aren't acceptable to the President."

Mr. Speaker, the President is not at fault that we have not met our deadlines. It is the Republican leadership's fault, and yet they are trying to use process here on attaching legislation that is wrong, that when they took the leadership of this House they said they would not do, and they are doing it here today, and it is wrong, and the Republicans are putting at risk the credit of this country. The Republicans are putting at risk our trust funds and our ability to pay the obligations of this country, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we have said from our side of the aisle bring a clean debt extension and we will support it, but this bill is wrong. It should be defeated.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I would just like to state very briefly that I am going to vote for the temporary debt ceiling even though it does not contain the elimination of the Department of Commerce, which I

think is a very key and important thing for us to do in producing a smaller, more limited, more focused Federal Government, and this is something that this House has already agreed to and voted for. We received assurances from the Senate leadership that they will push for the elimination of the Department of Commerce the next available opportunity this year, so I urge my colleagues to vote for this temporary debt ceiling as we continue to move forward and we do what the country is asking, and that is just a very simple thing of what everybody else has to do, and it is balance the budget. I sit here on this floor, and I listen to the debate, and it seems to me it is terribly harsh about something that we have been negligent in doing for so many years, and that is just simply balancing the budget, and I would urge the American people to look past the rhetoric and say, "Yes, you have got to do it. You have got to deliver, and you've got to deliver a balanced budget." This is a critical step to be able to accomplish that goal.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, actions being taken by this Congress are a frontal attack on Medicare. By continuing to insist on a short-term debt increase that ties the hands of the President, Congress is putting the U.S. Government and its good name at risk.

Repeatedly, we have heard that the House passed budget would protect and save Medicare. Well, the actions taken here the last few days put Medicare at great risk.

Medicare does not need to be put at risk or even involved in this debate. The solution is simple. Bring a clean debt extension to the floor.

This legislation includes a payment priority system, which is nothing but an unnecessary political ploy. And yes, this ploy can harm Medicare. The reason for this scheme is to protect Social Security. Social Security is already protected. The Social Security trust funds will not be used for any purpose other than to assure the payment of benefits to Social Security recipients.

Medicare should be protected. If Treasury is forced to prioritize payments, the nonpriority payments such as Medicare will not be paid. Why are we pulling the rug out from under seniors? They rely on Medicare and they expect payments to be made.

If you really want to save and protect Medicare, you will pass a clean debt extension.

Isn't it ironic that we are here on Veterans Day and we are debating legislation that could result in the failure of benefits being paid to veterans.

The debt ceiling legislation before us plays a dangerous game that is deadly to seniors. This legislation will put the U.S. Government in default if the President does not sign the budget.

We all know very well that the President cannot sign this budget. Congress

is way behind. The budget conference has not had one public session. Conferees on my side of the aisle are waiting to be contacted. Over half the 13 annual appropriations bills have not been sent to the President.

The Republicans are putting Medicare at extreme risk. This legislation will put the United States into default. Once the Government defaults, Medicare benefits will not be paid.

Treasury has been acting responsibly and already taken steps to avoid default, because of Congress' failure to pass a debt limit increase.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am just a freshman that came here this year, but as somebody who served in local government and was close to the people for over 20 years as a representative, the citizens kept asking, "Why can't Washington produce a balanced budget," and now I understand after I have been here why Washington has not been able to do it, because there are always good excuses for voting no against a balanced budget, there is always some detail that is more important than balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to recognize that we are talking about something that everybody talks about but are not willing to do. I will not yield at this time, but, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to be able to celebrate with my daughter her birthday this week, and she would not know and does not know what a balanced budget means to her future, but there are people across this country that have children that are going to be moving into the market at the beginning of the next century, and there are children that are going to be graduating from high school in the year 2003, like my Briana and my Patrick, and all I ask this body to do is find reasons to say yes so their graduation present, Mr. Speaker, can be a balanced budget for their future.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] that this is not a balanced budget. Our colleagues are borrowing more money because they are not balancing the budget.

Now I love going home just as much as my colleague loves going home, but I think it is more important to stay here and balance the budget than to borrow more money.

When I was in the gentleman's shoes exactly 6 years ago right now, I got a call from the Bush White House, and they asked me to vote for a one-time extension to the debt, and I honored then President Bush's request.

Dog bit me once, dog's fault. Dog bites me twice, it is my fault. I will not vote again to raise the debt limit because this is not a balanced budget. If it was balanced, we would not be borrowing more money.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would say I would rather stay here this week and this month to have a balanced budget than to go to all the birthday parties in the world.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding this time to me, and I want to tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in fact I would be happy to have a colloquy about this particular issue, this debate is all about balancing the Federal budget, try, as you might, to obscure it with discussion about the content of the continuing resolution or, for that matter, the debt ceiling increase, and I want to point out to the American people that only 72 Democrats, 72 out of 199, voted for a balanced budget when the Democratic substitute was offered on this floor by the so-called Blue Dog Coalition. In fact the Democrat minority leader, the Democrat minority whip, both voted against the Democrat version of a balanced budget. The majority of Members speaking over there today have voted against the balanced budget and have yet to vote for a balanced budget in this Congress.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am, as the gentleman knows, one of those Democrats that voted for a balanced budget amendment, voted for the Stenholm budget, voted for the coalition balanced budget amendment which gets us to the balanced budget by 2002 and, in fact, cuts more money, as my colleague knows, faster than the Republican alternative.

Having said that, I do not believe this is a responsible thing for us to do, to put at risk the credit of the United States when we clearly know we do not have agreement between the President and ourselves. However, we do have agreement on getting to a balanced budget by the President and ourselves. Once we pass the appropriation bills, we will do that.

□ 1300

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am one of those who voted to balance our budget when that recently came before this House. Yesterday we offered a motion to recommit that was very simple. It would have altered the debt limit provided for by 30 days. It would have provided a window that would say that from the

time the reconciliation bill hits the President's desk until we reach the debt ceiling limit, there would be a 30-day period in which we could work in a bipartisan way to develop a plan that will balance the Federal budget and would avoid a default by the Federal Government.

It was a clean motion. It was written on a single piece of paper. It was written without any kind of partisan distractions. It was said by my friends on the other side that our motion could be an indefinite extension of the debt. Let us be clear, the only way that motion could allow for an indefinite extension of the debt limit is if the majority in the Congress failed to present the President with a reconciliation bill. That is the only way, period.

It was also said that our motion would somehow allow the Treasury Department to raid the Social Security trust funds during this period. This just is not true. The Treasury has already stated in clear and certain terms that it will not touch the Social Security trust fund in its effort to manage the Federal debt.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, we could end this controversy right here and now by rejecting this debt limit bill, and send to the other body the motion to recommit that we took up yesterday instead. We could pass this clean language and not risk a Presidential veto. We could give a great Christmas present to the American people, one that I believe they had on the very top of their list last November. That is, Democrats and Republicans, working together in a bipartisan fashion, passing a reconciliation bill which balances the Federal budget without partisan rancor and without placing the creditworthiness of this country at risk.

Vote against this bill. Let us pass a clean bill and get on with the business of balancing our budget.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get involved in this discussion today, but after a phone call from a constituent this morning, concerning whether or not she should remove her savings from Treasury notes and Treasury bonds and CD's, it suddenly occurred to me that this game that we are playing today is one that could be very harmful to a lot of unintended people.

It is true, December 12, we could be doing this between now and then. My fear is that we have spent 314 days getting us nowhere. We have 300 votes on this floor to balance the budget next week. The argument that this is required to get us to a balanced budget is purely political. We have the votes. It seems to me that we are missing something, but the people are not. We are missing it on the floor, particularly

with my friends on this side. We have not done our work. The Congress has not, in a bipartisan way, delivered to the President 13 appropriation bills and a reconciliation bill so that the President can say whether he is for or against it.

Though some will say, "He should be weighing in already," I am on the conference, I have not been consulted 1 second. I got a call from the president of the largest farm organization in Texas yesterday asking me, "Charlie, I hear we are getting close to a farm bill. What is in it?" I say, "Mr. Stallman, I have no idea." I confronted the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this morning an asked him, "What is going on?" And he said, "Charlie, if I knew, you would be the first to know if you would just ask me." Committee chairmen do not know what is in the bills that are coming before us in this heated debate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we could get away from some of this political rhetoric that is now occurring. If I have misspoken, and I would be happy to yield to any of my friends on the other side of the aisle, if I have said anything; I would be glad to have a discussion, as we had between the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] just a moment ago. But it seems to me that we are playing an unneeded political game, risking the good faith and credit of the United States in order to prove a political point. It seems to me the risk is not worth it.

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

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I simply want to point out that the President apparently, based on his recent statements, has come around to the belief that we can in fact balance the budget in 7 years. As the gentleman well knows, there is language in this debt ceiling increase, or debt ceiling extension legislation, that effectively commits the President to balancing the budget in 7 years, based on a CBO-certified plan.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. speaker, if I could reclaim my time, that is totally irrelevant to the discussion today. What we should do today is do our work, and then get on with the negotiations. That is irrelevant.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, every Republican has voted for a debt ceiling extension to \$5.5 trillion until September 1997. What we need to do is to simply pull that out of the reconciliation bill, pass it, and keep this Government on an even keel. There is no discussion about where the debt ought to be lifted to. It should be lifted to \$5.5 trillion until September 1997. Every single Republican has agreed with that.

The problem is that you have added additional very harmful provisions within this debt ceiling bill. I want to address these. These provisions were enacted by President Reagan in 1987. That is the last time we had the most serious debt ceiling crisis. President Reagan signed into law provisions that would make sure that our financial markets would not collapse, that we would not go through the same kind of thing we went through back in the 1980's, largely because of the tax cuts that ultimately created a grossly unbalanced budget. I am not going to go into the reasons for that. The point is we figured out how to correct it and not let it happen again.

This debt ceiling extension takes away those provisions. There is an article in the Post today. It says: "Financial analysts say the United States is unlikely to default," and it talks about how blase they all are. The reason they are is because they are assuming that those provisions enacted in 1987 are still law; in other words, we can borrow from other trust funds so as to get us by a crisis. Then there is a law that requires that that money be paid back to those trust funds.

This debt ceiling bill repeals those provisions. That is why it has to be defeated. That is why it has to be vetoed. One of those laws says that we can go into the civil service retirement trust fund and borrow that money, only on condition that it legally has to be repaid. We cannot do that under this law. In fact, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service wrote to the Federal Retirement Thrift Board, knowing that they are nonpartisan, there are a number of Republicans on it, and I assume that he thought he would get support for this bill.

They wrote back, and I am glad he is coming to the floor, and they said that if this debt ceiling bill is passed as currently written, Federal employees will lose \$3.5 million a day from their fund, because this debt ceiling bill does not allow us to repay that fund. It takes away these provisions that were designed to get us past this crisis. That is the problem.

Another thing it does, incidentally, and I think we ought to mention this, because we are honoring Veterans Day, it does not even allow us to pay veterans benefits if it pushes us into this kind of crisis situation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to address my words to the person, I believe, in this country who has worked the hardest for the last 2 years to bring our economy to the great economic conditions that we have today. That is our President of the United States, Bill

Clinton. I also want to remind everybody that he is a very conscientious person that thinks great things about this country and how well this country can do. What the Republican leadership is now proposing to do is to put him on the hot spot, to say, "If you veto this, then we may have a default in our bonds, in our Treasury notes, and the economy may go to blazes."

Mr. President, I want to tell you that I stand here today urging you to veto this lousy bill. I know, Mr. President, that you have said you would sign a clean, no-strings-attached, debt limit bill, that you would sign one even for a short period of time. But that is not what you are being faced with. No, the Republican leadership, led by his imperial majesty, Speaker GINGRICH, has decided that they are going to do a little blackmail, extortion, play the game of chicken. That is what the Speaker has brought us to.

I am not voting for it. No way. I feel too much for this great country of ours, like our President. I would not want to bring us to this brink of disaster for this country, just to prove a point that you are going to have to sign other bills that have been attached onto the debt limit bill.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said on this floor about what goes on back home. Back home, for years I have heard people complain about putting extraneous bills on top of other bills that do not belong on there. That is just what we have here today. That is just what this is, Mr. Speaker; nothing more, nothing less. If the President will sign a straight debt limit bill, why do we not send him a straight debt limit bill?

Because you do not want to do that. You want to try and make him sign a bill with a whole bunch of extraneous stuff on it that has nothing to do with a debt limit, has nothing to do with a balanced budget, in order to try to embarrass him. That is all it is, pure politics. You are playing politics with the greatness of this country. I do not know if you realize it or not, but we could have a lot of harm done to this country and the people of it simply because you want to play politics. Mr. President, veto the bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let us call it the way it is. Let us stop the charade here. What is going on here is Presidential politics and cheap politics at its worst. The attempt to embarrass the President of the United States, or to blackmail the President of the United States, is really not worthy of this great body.

If the Republican leadership were indeed serious about tackling the problem with the debt-limit extension, or the continuing resolution, we would be voting on clean bills, stripped down bills today that would do exactly that.

No one disagrees with the fact that the debt limit has to be extended, or that there needs to be a continuing resolution, but the attempt to junk it up, to pump it up with all kinds of things that do not belong in the bill to push the continued extreme Republican agenda is really not worthy of this institution.

Let me say to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle that a couple of polls came out today. The polls show that the American people have finally caught on to the Republican shell game, to the irresponsible shell game. Fifty-nine percent is the President's approval rating, the highest in a year and a half.

Sixty percent of the American people say that the President ought to veto the extreme Republican budget. In a generic question about whom would you vote for for Congress, Democrats or Republicans, the American people chose Democrats by a total of 50 to 44 percent.

The American people are not fools. The American people know where to point the finger if the Government should shut down. It is totally irresponsible to even be playing this game of brinksmanship. Let us sit down, put our heads together, work out a budget, work out differences on issues, but let us not hold America hostage. Let us not hold this debt-limit extension hostage, or the continuing resolution hostage. Let us have some responsibility. Vote no on this miserable bill.

□ 1315

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, it is true that Republicans on three occasions have unanimously voted to up the debt limit to \$5.5 trillion through September 1997. That is not the issue here. The issue is to try to jam the President of the United States, as I have said before.

Now, let me read a letter dated November 9, 1995, just 2 days ago. This is not a partisan issue. I quote from that letter:

While we may have differing views on the merits of the various issues being raised in the budget debate, we share the strong view that the debt limit should not be, should not be, should not be, embroiled in that debate. We urge that prompt action be taken to either raise the debt limit permanently to a level that would accommodate either of the budgets being proposed, or that a sufficient short-term increase be enacted to allow the debate over priorities to proceed in an orderly manner without impairing market confidence in our Nation's commitment to discharge its obligations.

Who signed that letter? Secretary Bentsen, Secretary under Clinton. Secretary Blumenthal, Secretary of the Treasury under Carter. Secretary George Shultz, Secretary of Labor and Secretary of the Treasury under Nixon

and Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan. Secretary G. William Miller, Secretary of the Treasury under Carter. William E. Simon, Secretary of the Treasury under President Nixon and President Ford; and Secretary Fowler, Secretary under President Johnson.

In a letter dated June 28, 1990, from Secretary Brady, he said, "I urge the Congress to act in a timely manner on a debt limit increase in order," he said, "to avert a default with its adverse consequences on domestic and international confidence and trust in the United States."

Be responsible. Reject this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, let us just be honest about what is going on here. We on the Democratic side are sort of innocent bystanders. What is going on is that Republicans cannot agree with Republicans. You have some people in this House, about 80, who do not care if we default, who brought in four experts to say, default does not matter, despite the fact that everybody else knows that you are playing with fire. Instead, they want to use the debt ceiling as a vehicle for their extremist ideology.

First, as has been said, the American people do not buy that ideology, and that is why they need the debt ceiling, because they cannot do it alone. A stand-alone bill will never pass. But second, it is playing with fire. The Senate realized you were playing with fire, House Republicans; that is why they stripped the bill of so many things.

Many on your side realize you are playing with fire. Now, get with it. Pass a clean debt ceiling, and let us have the ideological debates on substantive bills where they should be.

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

Mr. Speaker, enough has already been said about this. This is an attempt to blackmail the President, to come bargain with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE, who have failed to get the necessary budget documents to him. They should have been there months ago. Yet they are here complaining, Mr. President, come bargain with us, lead us out of this swamp that we have gotten ourselves in.

I am for a debt ceiling increase. Every Republican in this Congress has voted, probably three times already this year, to increase the debt ceiling to \$5.5 trillion which will take us into 1997. This whole debate today is just a charade. If they would just do as they are supposed to do and what they are required to do, all of this could be done. The Government would not have to be closed down. They are trying to hold a pistol to the President's head to make him bargain, and they are not even ready to bargain. They have not even presented their own chips on all of this.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I shall not consume that much time, and I know that that will come as a relief to everybody on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of points to my colleagues today. We have heard that this is playing political games, that this is just partisan politics. We are taking the political easy way out. None of us believes that. Had it been politically easy, it would have been done years ago.

Balancing this budget is not easy. It is one of the most difficult things that this Congress has had to come to grips with in the 25 years that I have been here. The politics, if there is any, is to continue to sweep under the rug until after the next election the tough decisions. I personally do not think that is good enough for my children and my grandchildren.

It has been said what we are doing is wrong. What is wrong about trying to get to a balanced budget, a real balanced budget? By CBO numbers, the real numbers, the tough numbers, we are shooting real bullets when we talk about balancing the budget in 7 years by CBO numbers. We hear the hyperbole and the extreme rhetoric which I find frankly offensive and inappropriate.

When we are called terrorists, particularly coming on the heels of that tragic event that occurred in Israel, and the people of Israel know the meaning of the world terrorist, and that offensive rhetoric has been hurled by the other side at us. Early in the year as we moved toward trying to make these tough decisions, to be called Nazis and Hitler is highly offensive to me, and inappropriate, and does not belong out of the mouth of a Member of this Congress.

But we move on in this very, very difficult job, and I understand that this is not Democrat or Republican. When children are born into the world today, they are not born as Democrats or Republicans. As they grow up, they make the decision in which party they wish to identify, or perhaps no party at all. But each one of them is the recipient of the curse that we place on their heads by refusing to take the tough road of a balanced budget. I do commend my colleagues on the Democrat side who have been willing to vote for a tough balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, we should act as Americans concerned for the future. I have said earlier, and I am going to say it again, I had a grandson last week. I am very proud of that little fellow, but he came into this world with an obligation of \$187,000 on his head to pay the interest on this existing national debt for the rest of his life. We should not elevate that one dollar. Unfortunately, the glidepath to get into balance where we do not have to borrow any more will cause us to borrow some additional money.

As the gentleman from Virginia said, we voted for \$5.5 trillion debt ceiling increase, and that is right. But I say to my friend from Virginia, it was coupled with a balanced budget by the year 2002 by CBO numbers. And yes, we are applying the pressure by our drop-dead December 12 date. But that pressure does not apply just to the president; it applies to us in the Congress. Both of us are being put under pressure to come together and to resolve the most difficult thing that we have undertaken in the 25 years that I have been in the Congress of the United States.

We know, every one of us who has been in any legislative body, whether it is in the State of whether it is here, we will not make the tough decisions until we are forced against the wall to do it. That has been a problem in every democracy. Socrates, 400 years before Christ, said that, when the masses of the people find they can vote themselves prosperity out of the public Treasury, democracy is no longer possible. Democracies have this frailty.

We must find a way to apply even pressure to the White House and to the Congress to force us together at the bargaining table. I say to Members, my friends on both sides of the aisle, that a month is enough. We have waited long enough. We know all of the pieces in the puzzle. All we have to do is sit down and negotiate a balanced budget by CBO numbers in 7 years without new taxes.

We invite the President to come and do this in good faith, but we will never resolve this problem unless the Congress and the President come together. I say to my friend from Texas, it is not just bipartisanship in the Congress, it is the President coming to join with the Congress. We all know what happened this year. He started the year with his budget.

In our committee, and the members of our committee know this, his Secretary said a balanced budget is unimportant. We are not going to balance a budget. It is unimportant. Then he finally came around and said, well, I cannot be for a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Show me your plan, you cannot do it. And we did it. I say, to the credit of the Democrats who voted for their alternative balanced budget, they did it too. But the President did not think we could do it in the Congress.

Then, when he saw we could do it, he came back and he said, well, I will be for a 10-year balanced budget by my OMB numbers, not CBO numbers. And yet he stood right here at this point and told the Congress on February 17, 1993, that the CBO numbers were the only real numbers, and that the American people were entitled to know that we worked off of the same numbers. But now he has gone back to the rosy scenario on the stage with OMB. He does not balance the budget by CBO numbers in 10 years under OMB. He leaves \$200 billion a year in deficit. But

that is the last proposal we have seen from the President.

Mr. President, please, please, come with us, and work with us to get this job done. And yes, the pressure is on both of us. We can do it by December 12. This is not game playing, this is conscientious effort to force a resolution for the most historic thing that we can do for our children and their children.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 262, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 185, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 785]

YEAS—219

Archer	Doolittle	Houghton
Armey	Dornan	Hunter
Bachus	Dreier	Hutchinson
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Hyde
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Inglis
Ballenger	Ehlers	Istook
Barr	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	English	Jones
Barton	Ensign	Kasich
Bass	Everett	Kelly
Bateman	Ewing	Kim
Bereuter	Fawell	King
Bilbray	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Bilirakis	Flanagan	Knollenberg
Bliley	Foley	Kolbe
Blute	Fowler	LaHood
Boehkert	Fox	Largent
Boehner	Franks (CT)	Latham
Bonilla	Franks (NJ)	LaTourette
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Laughlin
Brewster	Frisa	Lazio
Brownback	Funderburk	Leach
Bryant (TN)	Galleghy	Lewis (KY)
Bunning	Ganske	Lightfoot
Burton	Gekas	Linder
Callahan	Gilchrest	Livingston
Calvert	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Camp	Gilman	Longley
Canady	Goodlatte	Lucas
Castle	Goss	Manzullo
Chabot	Graham	Martini
Chambliss	Greenwood	McCollum
Chenoweth	Gunderson	McCrery
Chrysler	Gutknecht	McDade
Clinger	Hall (TX)	McInnis
Coble	Hancock	McIntosh
Coburn	Hansen	McKeon
Collins (GA)	Hastert	Metcalf
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Meyers
Cooley	Hayes	Mica
Cox	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Crane	Hefley	Molinari
Crapo	Heineman	Moorehead
Cremeans	Herger	Morella
Cubin	Hillery	Myers
Cunningham	Hobson	Myrick
Davis	Hoekstra	Nethercutt
Deal	Hoke	Neumann
DeLay	Horn	Ney
Diaz-Balart	Hostettler	Norwood

Nussle	Salmon	Tauzin
Oxley	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Packard	Saxton	Thomas
Parker	Scarborough	Thornberry
Paxon	Schaefer	Tiahrt
Petri	Schiff	Torkildsen
Pombo	Seastrand	Upton
Porter	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Portman	Shaw	Waldholtz
Pryce	Skeen	Walker
Quinn	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Regula	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Riggs	Solomon	Weller
Roberts	Souder	White
Rogers	Spence	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Wolf
Roth	Stump	Young (AK)
Roukema	Talent	Zeliff
Royce	Tate	Zimmer

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—28

Berman	Klug	Spratt
Boucher	LaFalce	Studds
Buyer	Lewis (CA)	Thornton
Dickey	Martinez	Torrice
Dicks	McHugh	Tucker
Dingell	Owens	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Goodling	Pickett	Young (FL)
Johnston	Quillen	
Kaptur	Shuster	

□ 1349

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Young of Florida for, with Mr. Waxman against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Ms. Kaptur against.
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 261, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115), making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and I offer a motion.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the Senate amendments are considered as read.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, line 20, after "1948," insert: *section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236),*

Page 10, line 19, after "resolution," insert: *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.*

Page 15, strike out line 1 and all that follows over to and including line 7 on page 36, and insert:

TITLE III

PROHIBITION ON SUBSIDIZING POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS WITH TAXPAYER FUNDS

SEC. 301. (a) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any organization receiving Federal grants in an amount that, in the aggregate, is greater than \$125,000 in the most recent Federal fiscal year, shall be subject to the limitations on lobbying activity expenditures under section 4911(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, except that, if exempt purpose expenditures are over \$17,000,000 then the organization shall also be subject to a limitation on lobbying of 1 percent of the excess of the exempt purpose expenditures over \$17,000,000 unless otherwise subject to section 4911(c)(2)(A) based on an election made under section 501(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) An organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that engaged in lobbying activities during the organization's previous taxable year shall not be eligible to receive Federal funds constituting a taxpayer subsidized grant. This paragraph shall not apply to organizations described in section 501(c)(4) with gross annual revenues of less than \$3,000,000 in such previous taxable year, including Federal funds received as a taxpayer subsidized grant.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b))).

(7) GRANT.—The term "grant" means the provision of any Federal funds, appropriated under this or any other Act, to carry out a public purpose of the United States, except—

(A) the provision of funds for acquisition (by purchase, lease, or barter) of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States;

(B) the payments of loans, debts, or entitlements;

(C) the provision of funds to, or distribution of funds by, a Federal court established under Article I or III of the Constitution of the United States;

(D) nonmonetary assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to organizations approved or recognized under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code; and

(E) the provision of grant and scholarship funds to students for educational purposes.

(8) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(9) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(I) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(II) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis.