Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Barton
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Calvert
Chapman
Conyers
Edwards
Filner
Ford
Gibbons
Hall (OH)
Harman
Jacobs
LaFalce
Lantos
Manton
Martinez
Meek
Myers
Owens
Quillen
Quinn
Serrano
Williams

☐ 1711

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 186, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 879]

AYES—224

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

NOES—186

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

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Calvert
Chapman
Conyers
Edwards
Filner
Ford
Gibbons
Hall (OH)
Harman
Jacobs
LaFalce
Lantos
Manton
Martinez
Myers
Owens
Quillen
Quinn
Serrano
Williams

☐ 1728

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST THAT COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS BE DISCHARGED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 131, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 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 131, a clean continuing resolution extending the date of the existing CR to January 26, authorizing a 2.4 percent military pay raise effective January 1, and eliminating the 6-month disparity between COLA payment dates for military and civilian retirees in fiscal 1996, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the guidelines issued consistently by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 534 of the House rules manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION PROVIDING DEFICIT REDUCTION AND ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET BY FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise to

give notice that I will seek recognition as a question of the privileges of the House to offer a resolution in the following form. The resolution is at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the resolution for the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas clause 1 of rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that ''Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively'';

Whereas article 1, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution states that: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law;

Whereas today, December 21, 1995, marks the 81st day that this Congress has been delinquent in fulfilling its statutory responsibility of enacting a budget into law; and

Whereas by failing to enact a budget into law this body has failed to fulfill one of its most basic constitutionally mandated duties, that of appropriating the necessary funds to allow the Government to operate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules is authorized and directed to forthwith report a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2530 (a bill to provide for deficit reduction and achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Mississippi that under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or a place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days, its being properly noticed. That designation will be announced at a later time. In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Mississippi will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not at this point making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. The determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be kind enough to give me some indication of how much warning that I would receive as a Member as to when this would be brought before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will give adequate notice, as has always been the case.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Could the chair give a better definition of ''adequate notice''?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not at this time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the Chair.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 119

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 119.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the majority leader about the schedule.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me express my appreciation for the patience of the Members over these days leading up to the holidays. I know that it has been difficult for Members and their families, but today I am more hopeful that the end is in sight.

I am pleased to announced that today there were very productive discussions between senior White House officials and Members of the House and Senate leadership. I am also pleased to announce that starting tomorrow morning budget negotiations will begin between the congressional leadership and the President on balancing the budget.

It is our hope that these negotiations will be successful and expeditious. We believe that these negotiations, if conducted seriously, could be completed very quickly, perhaps in only a few days. It is our intention to bring to the floor as quickly as possible any agreement that balances the budget in 7 years using CBO numbers. At the same time, I do not want to keep Members in town unnecessarily. I will be announcing tomorrow a more definitive schedule for the next several days, but my expectation is to have the House in recess pending word of an agreement.

Depending on how the negotiations go tomorrow morning, the recess could be only for a day or two or it could last until Wednesday. I will recommend that the Members make plane reservations for sometime after 3 tomorrow afternoon, but understand that, if negotiations are moving quickly, we may stay to complete a balanced budget. I am sorry I cannot be more specific at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to advise our Members that we have had the last vote of the evening, but we will have important work in the morning. I will be, in a moment, asking unanimous consent for a 9 a.m. time to commence work in the morning. But if that is granted, we would be dealing with House Resolution 299, a proposal for House royalty changes, possibly the ICC conference report. If we can work out all the details related to it, it may be possible tomorrow that we may be able to take up legislation that would affect D.C. government funding and AFDC.

So we still have important work for us to do tomorrow. We hope to be able to conclude it expeditiously and get Members on their way. Again, let me remind Members, we would be in under those conditions, under recess. We would continue to work, and, as soon as something of import were available, we would give Members ample notice and then bring them back as quickly as possible to reconvene the House and complete that work.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman assured us that we would have a 24-hour notice on any return during the recess, the one we had prior. Is that still the standard that we could all be able to live with so that we could come from wherever we may be with family?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point. Mr. Speaker, I should say that I believe, in fact, I assured 12 hours.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, 12 hours did the gentleman say?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, that was the position I took before. I do understand the problems of travel. I can assure that there would be definitely a 12-hour notice before we would convene business. I will try to be as considerate as I possibly can to make sure Members from the most remote locations have an opportunity to get back.

I understand how difficult it is. I would like to be, I would like to guarantee a 24-hour. I am just not sure that I could make such a guarantee and make it stick. But I think I can say with total confidence Members would have a 12-hour notice.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The problem, of course, is going to be that Members are going to be perhaps at greater than normal distance. Their staff is unlikely to be at post here. It may be more difficult for Members to get reservations during the holiday season. All of these things complicate the ability to do a short-time turnaround, and therefore I think, more than last week, we probably will need at least 24 hours for Members to be able to be here for what could be among the most important votes of this session.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is well taken. Let me just say that I will address the issue with all the generosity and advance notice that I am able to give.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman about the schedule that he has outlined for tomorrow. I have been told that the State of California, that I represent, has a billion and a quarter dollars in Medicaid payments that are needed for us to be able to make our commitments to all the providers and to the people who are beneficiaries of the MediCal Program in our State.

I noticed and I think there is tremendous relief on this side of the aisle that we will be dealing with the AFDC issue that just yesterday we were told was not an issue. Is there any possibility that we could deal with the Medicaid problem in terms of meeting the requirements? At least several of our