

We have had so many years of continuing resolutions around here. Continuing resolutions actually have traditions. This particular tradition is called the Michel formula. We worked it out on a bipartisan basis over the years. The lower of the two House funds. It is one of the great traditions, after 40 years of continuing resolutions out of Democrats. Now, they say they cannot take it. It is not something that ought to be included in this.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the sound, yea, I hear the distinct sound of hypocrisy fogging the minds in this Chamber, and we are not seeing the kind of bipartisanship, because they simply do not want to do what has been done in the past when they were in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, it is time, folks, to stop the excuses. It is time to stop the gimmicks. It is time to budget balance the budget. Start now. It would be nice to do it in a bipartisan way, but bipartisanship is not the intention of the minority.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker reminded me of an oft-quoted quote of the late Will Rogers when he said, "It ain't people's ignorance that bothers me so much; it is them knowing so much that ain't so that is the problem."

Medicare is not the issue today. The fundamental question is: Why is it in a continuing resolution? That is a simple question. It is not like we could not get a unanimous vote to have a clean CR sent to the President that he will sign. That can be done, guaranteed 100 percent.

The problem is we have spent 314 days not doing our work, as we have seen the chart time after time. Now, we are wasting 5 additional days in the same way we have wasted a good part of the previous 314 days, sending something to the President that the President has already said he would veto.

Mr. Speaker, I ask simply: Why are we doing this? Why are we wasting a weekend? Why are we having to have our own staffs get ready to be furloughed? Why are we having the possibility of 800,000 of our Federal workers going on a furlough? For what reason? To send a message to the President?

Mr. Speaker, the best way to send a message to the President is to do our work so we have got something to negotiate. And to those that say that is not an issue, what about those of us in this body that would like to work with somebody on appropriations bills, on the continuing resolution? Why do we have to have bloodhounds out finding out where you are meeting? Why, when we call the chairman of our own committee, they do not know what is going on? Because the Speaker has not told them yet what it is we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is very clear. We can send a clean CR; we can spend

this weekend working instead of speechmaking; we can get on with doing our work and we can quit being ugly to each other and the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, first I want to regress just to address one thing on what we did a few minutes earlier in passing an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I did not get to mention it in my remarks, but basically, we heard they are dipping into these trust funds now; and the Secretary of Treasury says it does not matter what the Congress does; Even though they are in charge, we are going to steal from these funds no matter what.

But, in fact, if we ran in the private sector our retirement funds in the fashion that this Congress operates, we would basically go to jail. It cannot be done that way in the private sector. The only difference here is that we have an unlimited resource and that is taxpayers' wallets.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about why we are in this situation, and we are in this situation. Until October 1, this Congress was running under the past Congress' financial plan. We do not like that plan. We do not think that the solution to the problems of this country and this Congress is throwing more money at problems.

Regarding education, for example, we spend billions of dollars and look at what we get. In my communities and in Florida, 50 percent of our students entering community college need remedial education. Is that success?

In the area of environmental protection, they say we want to do damage. When we spent 85 percent of our money on attorneys' fees and studies in our Superfund, is that success?

Mr. Speaker, because of this process, because they had their way to run this place and misused it until October 1, now we want to send more direction. We want to send some guidance on not just throwing money at these problems, but doing it with some wisdom, with some direction, with some results, and with some economy and some efficiency.

Under current law, we cannot even drink the water in this community today. So, we are asking for changes, and we want to see them changed through this appropriations process.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what is the regulation in the House with regard to use of charts on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe that charts

may be used when the person who is speaking has placed them up, but they are not to be used in the Chamber unless the person who is speaking has them up.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry, if charts are knowingly inaccurate, are they allowed to be used on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of a chart.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry, and then what would be the process of the House? What is the remedy available to the House if the House does have objections to a false or misleading chart on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXX of the House, if objection is made, then the question on the use of the chart will be put. The question can be placed before the Members.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify, if the chart that is involved is, in fact, a distortion of someone's remarks, so that it constitutes essentially a lie, is that chart then permitted to be used, unless the House ruled otherwise?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection can be made by any Member to any chart that is used.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, and that objection does not have to have a basis?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of any chart.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, very recently, I believe it was last week, an objection was made to the use of charts during the abortion debate, and ultimately those charts were permitted to be used on the floor as an issue of free speech. Is this the same issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote was taken, and a majority of the membership of the House made the decision that that chart in that instance could be used.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of free speech?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote was a procedure that was determined under rule XXX of the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation when a chart is used and the quote is crushingly accurate, but a Member in the Chamber does not like it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXX, if it is crushingly accurate, any Member may still object.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the ruling of the Chair with respect to quotes that are taken entirely out of context and which relate to an agency rather than a program?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not believe that that is a parliamentary inquiry.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House which precludes a Member from bringing to the floor in the form of a chart an exact quotation from the front page of a daily newspaper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As we stated, under rule XXX any Member may object to the use of any chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, even if it is accurate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may object to the use of any chart and cause the question of its use to be determined by the House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if a Member objects to numbers or quotes or what have you, do they have the responsibility to offer the source of their evidence that they are untrue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a fascinating parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will state again that under rule XXX, any Member may object to the use of any chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am so glad we have finally gotten to the crux of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in this Chamber and I have heard the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] three times ask unanimous consent to bring up a clean continuing resolution.

Well, that was denied. Now we know why, because the Speaker opened his mouth before engaging his brain and what we are trying to do today is we are now trying to jam it to the President. They want to jam it to the President. They are taking all of this stuff out, except the increase on Medicare premiums so that people can pay \$13 more per month, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Not me, but the Congressional Budget Office says it will be about \$13 a month more, and they want to send this little message to the seniors that they are trying to get the President to sign off on this.

Now, if this was not the issue, if what Speaker GINGRICH had revealed as their own strategy, their secret strategy, was not the issue, why do they not let the gentleman from Wisconsin just bring up the clean CR?

The main thing hanging in there is this little present for our seniors so they can pay the tax benefit, or the

crown jewel as the Speaker calls it, for their rich friends.

□ 1445

All those people who make over \$500,000 a year. So the Speaker says they cannot get rid of it right away, it is not politically smart, but we are going to give it away in transition.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to point out that the gentlewoman's chart was not objected to, but she knows full well that the Speaker was talking about the demise of HCFA, not the Social Security program. It may be an accurate quote, but that is the kind of distortion that this argument has gone off on. We are talking about a 14-day continuing resolution and we get all these extraneous arguments that have no relationship to the resolution. That is a totally fabricated argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] to show a real quote that is relevant.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this is really what this debate is all about. Clinton said he knew that a lot of people in the room were "still mad about the 1993 budget and they think I raised their taxes too much. It might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too."

That was President Clinton that said that. Maybe that is a misquote, but I think he said that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair will observe that no objection was made on the use of either chart.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I recall seeing on videotape this exact quote from the Senate majority leader, speaking on Medicare to the American Conservative Union:

I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, 1 out of 12, because we knew it would not work in 1965.

That is an exact quote from the Senate majority leader, Mr. DOLE.

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think that might have been what he meant to say, or was he taken out of context?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would yield myself a lot more time to read the chart that describes the Democrat, President Clinton plan to save Medicare. But there is none so it does not take any time to describe it.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution, as my colleague from Texas said, should be a stopgap spending measure. It should not be an

opportunity for extremists within the Republican Party to raise the Medicare premiums. That is what has been done here.

This bill raises the Medicare premium. Late last Tuesday night, Republicans voted to raise the Medicare premium from 24 percent to 31.5 percent. That means instead of the \$42 that the seniors were going to have to pay, they are now going to pay \$53 a month. And that is going to start on New Year's Day. Happy New Year, American seniors.

The Republican budget means seniors will pay more for Medicare. That is why 60 percent of the American public would like the President to veto this budget. And it is all part of a grand strategy, which is here with the very words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]:

We do not get rid of Medicare in round one because we do not think that that is politically smart, and we don't think that this is the right way to transition. We believe it is going to wither on the vine.

That is what we are doing, we are having Medicare wither on the vine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe again that many Members have indicated that they hope to leave this afternoon to get to Veterans Day events and the Chair would like to encourage Members to move along. We will try to stick with the time allotments.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair advise Members of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. OBEY] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. My colleagues, this place can be fun, and it has been fun the last half-hour or so. But I tend to think that people looking in, the folks we work for, think we are being a little frivolous just on the threshold of this Government shutting down and perhaps resulting in fiscal insolvency. I suggest we get a little less silly, put the charts away and commit to do what the President, within the hour, has asked us to do and that is stay here this weekend, compromise this out with him this weekend.

I know the Senate has gone, but we can bring PHIL GRAMM and BOB DOLE back from campaigning. NEWT GINGRICH can come back from signing books. We can go down to the White House and compromise with the President. We can get this done. Let us stop the silliness and agree to stay here this weekend as the President of the United States has requested we do.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to even direct it to the minority

leader as well, Members want to go home this weekend. They want to work with their veterans, with the veterans parades, with the veterans organizations out of respect for them.

But let me tell Members, there are those of us like myself that are going to stay here this weekend. So is NEWT GINGRICH, so is BOB DOLE, so are our leaders and I hope your leaders as well. We are going to be here, and we are going to be working so the rest of my colleagues can go home to try to work out these differences. So let us stop this silliness.

If Members want to stay here, stay with us and we will work to resolve these problems.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the gentleman, in fact, if the President were serious about negotiating these very complex and difficult issues, wouldn't he have spent some of the time that he spent on the airplane for 26 hours going and coming from Prime Minister Rabin's funeral to talk to the Speaker and to talk to the Senate majority leader, other than to say hello? But, as I understand it, there was no discussion at all. And it was directly the responsibility of the President to initiate those conversations.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I were the President of the United States, I would have been in the back of that plane talking to each and every one of you trying to sell you on my position. That is a responsible President.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It did not happen.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this debate has become so trivialized that this bill is going to rise or fall based on how much the Speaker's ego was damaged because the President on the way to a state funeral for a fallen friend did not spend enough time schmoozing with the Speaker when he had two former Presidents in the plane and had a few things to do on the way.

If the Speaker is not bigger than that, if the majority's nose is out of joint on that, then we really do have a problem in this country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I point out to the gentleman, look, we did not raise the issue about staying here. We have been working long hours, both parties have been working long hours trying to get these bill done. Let us not start posturing and saying we should stay all weekend when all we have to do is vote, get this bill out of here, send it over to the Senate. They will agree to this and send it to the President on time. The end of the time for the present continuing resolution is midnight, November 13. Then the President can sign this resolution. That is all he has to do and Government will continue.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we share your desire to show respect for our veterans. It is just that we do not find much respect in cutting Medicare for 8.8 million veterans in this country who are Medicare eligible, nor do we find it appropriate that when you do not include the cuts on waste and fraud in this resolution, you do not include the cuts in health care expenditures. The only cuts you provide is for the veterans and the other people in America who rely on Medicare by raising their premiums come January. That is not much respect.

What this resolution does is to set up a procedure where by at 5 on Monday the Republicans in the House and the Republicans in the Senate still have not reached agreement. On the last day in which this continuing resolution is in effect, we will not know if they can agree among themselves on the future of this Government. And guess who is going to pick up the tab for it? It is going to come at a cost of millions of dollars a day just to shut down the Government. Unless Rupert is giving NEWT GINGRICH another book contract, the taxpayer is going to have to pick up that tab.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the misinformation, I brought a gentleman that knows what he is talking about on Medicare.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is going to tell us the truth about Medicare.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am more than willing to do this over and over again. I apologize for not being here. We were in conference trying to move forward, as Members seemingly have asked us to do. But obviously when they misrepresent facts and obstruction the way you have.

Everybody in the United States knows, except those of you who are willing to admit you also know, Medicare is in trouble. Not on a partisan basis, on a bipartisan basis. It is an entitlement program that has to be checked, controlled and curbed. And it has to be done in a way that takes into consideration the interests of the beneficiaries who are receiving the benefits today and the people who are going to receive the benefits tomorrow. No one should argue that point.

It is perfectly legitimate to how you solve the program. There are a lot of different ways to solve it. I will tell you one way that is pure, unmitigated political hypocrisy. And that is to pander to seniors and say the way we are going to save Medicare is to reduce your premium. That is absolute pandering. You folks have done that for so

many years, it is hard to break old habits, and we understand that.

But let me tell you what we have to do is every one in this society share in the problem. No one group can evade sharing in the problem.

You folks have asked people who are working over and over again to bear virtually the total cost of the program. Six times in the last 10 years you either increased the payroll tax or you increased the percentage that people have to pay into the payroll tax to cover up the problem in Medicare.

Finally, in 1993, you blew off the lid. No person in America makes enough money to evade the payroll tax that you increased to 1.45 percent on those individuals.

□ 1500

My colleagues' answer would be more of the same. If my colleagues do more of the same, it takes two to three times the increase on that payroll tax just to get us to the year 2002, the year in which the trustees said part A is going bankrupt, and my colleagues cannot tolerate a 10-percent-plus-a-year increase in part B, they cannot tolerate it. If they do, even their honorable Senators on the other side, KERREY, said it is unsustainable, and they are going to give the seniors a reduction in the premium. Absolute pandering.

What we have to say is, "Seniors, will you bear your fair share?" And what is the seniors' fair share? Keep the premium where it is today. That is all we ask.

I am over there right now telling the Senators where they wanted to increase the deductible on seniors from \$100 to \$150 that that is unacceptable, where they said, "Let's index it," that that is unacceptable, where they wanted copays, that that is unacceptable. What we have said is all we ask of seniors is to keep the premium where it is, and my colleagues come down to this floor and pander: Hey, we want to reduce the premium for seniors.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues do not have any solutions; we do. Guess what it is? It is to take a look at what is going out in America every day today in health care. They are not paying 10-percent-a-year increases. What they are doing is saying create a choice structure that allows people through choice to get some of the benefits that the children and the grandchildren of today's beneficiaries get. They cannot do that right now because we have a closed government system that operates one way basically, and that is a fee-for-service system. What we are saying is, "Let's open up the fee-for-service system." What has happened in the private sector when it opened up the fee-for-service system to choice? That fee-for-service system is withering away, it is disappearing. It is no longer the predominant health care delivery system in California. It is 75 percent managed care.

What the Speaker said was that what is going on outside in the real world,

the fee-for-service system withering away, should happen to Medicare if people choose to have it happen, and what we hope is that we create a program successfully enough to attract people to a positive program in terms of the growth so that the old-fashioned system that was increasing at 10 percent a year will not be the dominant system.

My colleagues better hope we are successful. I know they do not want to help us, but my colleagues better hope we are successful because, if we are not, this entitlement program is going to eat us all alive. We do not want to tell seniors they cannot have the old system.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to tell the seniors that they have to do something. We want to work together to create a positive structure where young people and seniors sharing in the responsibility stave off bankruptcy and reduce the cost of the Federal budget so we can balance our budget.

What we want out of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is to simply join us and tell seniors, "Share, help us solve the problem, stay when you are on your premium, and we can solve the problem." What is their answer? Pander to seniors and reduce the premium. My colleagues are not only in the minority, they are outrageous.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where my friend from California, Mr. THOMAS, went. I hope he gets his facts right.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is many of us supported an alternative which sustains Medicare, balances the budget, does not provide the type of premium increase for all elderly as in the Republican proposal on an appropriation bill. The reality is my colleagues do not have to go to 31½ percent of costs. I agree the premium should not go down. But my colleagues are having this huge jump, and at the same time we have millions of poor elderly widows who receive their premiums and their deductibles paid by Medicaid. My colleagues are also cutting that program. So, they are doing premium increases that are not required to stabilize Medicare to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues are punishing poor, elderly widows because of their Medicaid cuts. That is right; they are mean cuts, and the reason they have to go so deep with the increase in their part B premiums, reductions of benefits to elderly, poor widows in most cases; and do not come with this language about protecting them, my colleagues are not, the facts do not bear our colleagues out in Medicaid; It is simply because they want to pay for their tax cut. We know where the bulk of those benefits go: 50 percent or more to people with incomes over \$100,000.

So let us get it straight. We do not need to do their extreme things. We can do it reasonably. But even forget-

ting about that, even if this were a reasonable approach, why should it be on the continuing resolution? Why? This is not a Medicare bill. Our friend from Louisiana has a continuing appropriations bill, and all of a sudden it is a Medicare bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. SPEAKER, the issue is not how much time the President has spent massaging the Speaker's ego on the airplane. The issue is whether or not we will try to force the President to provide for a huge increase in Medicare premiums as the price for keeping the Government going. That is not our obligation. Our obligation is to try to keep the Government going. We can do that with a clean resolution. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield the remaining 4½ minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in my view this is the most colossal waste of time and energy that I have seen. Our job as a Congress is to send the President legislation, and the President then either has to sign or to veto the legislation. I used to say the President's pen is worth two-thirds of us, and it is. Nothing is in the Constitution about negotiating on planes going to Israel; there is nothing in the Constitution about carrying on summit meetings and negotiations. The Constitution is clear. We send the legislation, and he signs or he vetoes the legislation.

We are now 6 weeks beyond the end of the fiscal year. The President has yet to receive the 13 appropriations bills that he was supposed to receive before that time came and went. He has yet to receive a budget bill. We call it by a funny name, a reconciliation bill. But it is a budget. He does not have it yet, and so here we are talking about a simple 2-week extension to keep the Government running and to keep interest rates from going up unnecessarily because we default on the debt.

Now in the midst of this legislation what our colleagues are insisting on doing is putting into this simple 2-week extension what they want to do in the budget by raising Medicare premiums, and we can argue until the cows come home on whether or not these premiums on Medicare should be increased. Most of us do not think they need to be increased like this, but whatever people's views, we should not be here at 3:10 Friday, November 10, 6 weeks after our work should have been done, talking about our ideological differences on Medicare or on who can lobby the Government.

When these bills get down to the President on Monday, or whenever they are going to get there, he is going to veto the bills, he has already said that, and then we are going to have to come back here and do what the Congress must do, which is to develop an-

other 2-week increase, or an extension, or a week, or whatever it is that we can pass, so that the Government will keep going, and let me just say for those who were not here, sometimes in the past, when we had a day or two when the Government did not operate, it is not a good experience for any of us, and it sure is not a good experience for the American people. They expect that we came here to do the job, to pass the legislation, and then the President can decide what he is going to do.

Now I hope that we will get our wits together here in the next few days, and get a clean CR and a clean debt ceiling down to the President before bad things happen so he can sign them, so we can then get down to the hard work of trying to reach an agreement that will reach a budget that is good for the American people. I am an optimist. I think we can do that, and I think we have the ability to figure that out in good will and in good faith. But we get nowhere by standing out here fighting about whether the ideological riders that we have in the budget should be in these simple 2-week extensions. It simply does us no good.

Now one final thing:

If we cannot reach a budget, and I hope we can, we may be back here talking about a year extension of a continuing resolution. I hope that does not happen, but, if we cannot agree, and maybe we cannot with the President on what this should be, then I think we ought to take these issues to the American people. We are talking about a 7-year budget. We are talking about a 7-year budget. We are talking about far-reaching changes in the Medicare Program. We are talking about far-reaching changes in the Medicaid Program. We are talking about a \$245 billion tax cut in the midst of trying to balance the budget in 7 years. Now if we cannot find that middle ground, and I am willing to try and find it, then I say let the President veto the bill, and let us do a 12-month extension without ideological riders, and let us proudly take these issues to the American people. They deserve the right to be cut into this decision, and I think I know the decision they are going to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself all the remaining time.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have completed business on five bills; we have not on eight. There are a few touchups to do those, and we can get them to the President's desk after we pass this continuing resolution. When we do that, we will complete the process, complete the process to put this

country on a glidepath toward a balanced budget by the year 2002, to reduce spending, to reduce taxes, to reduce the constant increase of Government from the other side, to reduce the bureaucracy, and to provide for freedom for the American people, higher productivity, and more jobs. But we cannot do it if we vote this down, which is what they want. They say this is a serious bill and that is why they are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues how serious their—our—Commander in Chief thinks it is. An AP wire—Associated Press—2:27 today; it says, and I quote:

"Less than an hour before the debt limit vote Clinton made a quick trip to the White House briefing room and then went golfing." He did not reiterate his threat to veto the bills.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republican's are reaching an all-time low with their dirty tactics that threaten the livelihood of so many Americans by playing a game of political chicken.

It is irresponsible and wrong for the Republicans to attach legislative riders to the continuing resolution. If we had a clean CR, we would all be home celebrating Veterans Day by now.

But instead, the Republicans have attached so many draconian riders to this legislation. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle this, What does raising Medicare premiums for seniors and placing lobbying restrictions on nonprofits have to do with keeping the Government up and running? Absolutely nothing.

I, for one, find it unconscionable that the Republicans are attaching so many extreme nongermane provisions to the continuing resolution and the debt limit extension. These irresponsible bills will leave President Clinton no choice but to veto them. As a result of these Republican shenanigans, veterans will not receive their disability checks, seniors will not receive their Medicare, and thousands of Federal employees in my district will be sent home next Tuesday in the wake of a Government shutdown.

It is dead wrong for the Republicans in Congress to play politics with peoples' lives.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 261, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 172, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 786]

YEAS—224

Allard
Archer
Arney
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)

NAYS—172

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

Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums

Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
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
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchee
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey

Berman
Boucher
Buyer
Dickey
Dingell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Frank (MA)
Johnston
Kaptur
Klug
LaFalce

Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—36

Lewis (CA)
Martinez
McHugh
Meehan
Neumann
Owens
Parker
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Quillen
Quinn
Rose

□ 1533

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. LaFalce against.

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.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to agree to Senate amendments on H.R. 2586 adopted earlier today.

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

There was no objection.