have been concerned and am concerned for the staff of the House. It has been a tough week, it will continue to be, their working on Saturday and Sunday, and it had been my intention to adjourn the House in their interest and that of their families.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me, if I might, ask the gentleman from Texas to reconsider that, because let me make the case that with respect to fast track, a highly controversial, momentous piece of legislation, probably one of the most important bills that we will have faced, certainly in this Congress, the Committee on Rules has only allowed 2 hours of debate on this bill. We have hundreds of Members who want to speak on this issue. We are boxed in a situation which the gentleman knows is a difficult situation. People need to be able to express themselves on this, and so we ask the opportunity on this side of the aisle to engage in special orders this evening for those who want to discuss this or any other issue.

We even ask that the Committee on Rules, which we understand will go back and come out with another rule, expand that debate time. It is not only on our side. The gentleman is going to have tens, if not hundreds of Members on his side of the aisle, certainly 100 members on his side of the aisle, who will not have an opportunity to speak on this. We cannot put together a cogent argument, we cannot put together a rational debate when we are given 30 seconds or a minute. I would ask my friend from Texas to reconsider the time on the bill in general debate, and I would also ask him to allow special orders without going ahead and adjourning this evening.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, I am sympathetic to his cause, but let me just cite to the gentleman the traditional rule that has been made in order on other GATT agreements. In 1988 there were 2 hours of debate only. In 1993 there was 1 hour of debate only. With the 1 hour that will be extended on the rule and 2 hours of general debate, it gives 3 hours on the issue. I know that there are some on the gentleman's side that thought that that was not enough. There were also a number, including some Democrats on the Committee on Ways and Means, that thought that that was ample time. But traditionally that is the amount of time.

Keep in mind this is not the agreement. When the agreement comes back, the gentleman and I and others will probably have about 8 hours to debate that agreement and even to amend it, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman from New York to whom I will yield in a second, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, requested 8 hours. I think the gentleman understands quite well that it is not just Members on our side of the aisle. We are going to have many Members on his side of the aisle who are going to want to speak and who will not be able to speak on this issue.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, perhaps I could offer something on this.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Michigan's point about the special orders. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would understand the natural concern I have had with respect to the members of the floor staff and their families, but I understand the gentleman's point, there are some folks on this side of the aisle who are interested, and I would not preempt their right to have the special order opportunities this evening.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a special appeal to my friend, the leader of the New York delegation, a leader in the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Under the rule, the Democrats that are in opposition to the fast track would have only 30 minutes. I know that the gentleman wants to stick by the tradition in how they have handled these things before, but I cannot begin to tell him the number of Members that are asking just to be heard to express themselves. There is a frustration that exists in the House where I truly believe that people do want to hear the debate. But in addition to this, I think that people want to explain their vote. Whether they vote for it, whether they vote against it, they want to have an opportunity to explain through whatever way to their constituents why they are voting that way on a subject matter which I truly do not believe is that well known to the American people. I know it is extraordinary action to take a review of the decision that the full committee has made, but in view of the fact that he has said more than once that senior members of the Committee on Ways and Means have said this is appropriate time, I can tell the gentleman that senior members of the Committee on Ways and Means have asked for a half-hour themselves to be able to debate. I hope whomever they are, they will stand up, because we are catching the devil trying to allocate time. The gentleman would do this House a great service if he could be more flexible in tradition of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding. As the majority leader and minority leader are aware, the leadership of the freshman Democrats and the freshman Republicans, once the schedule for the weekend was announced, conferred and would like to offer as a service to our colleagues, in light of the fact that most of us return home on weekends and do not have a church home here in Washington, a joint service provided by the freshman Democrats and the freshman Republicans at 1 o'clock Sunday in 1100 Longworth for Members and their families.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from California, the Caucus chair.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply wanted to add my voice to those on this side who have a desire to have more time to debate this issue. There is no question that both caucuses, the caucus and the conference are divided on this but Members feel deeply about it and want to be able to make their case directly to their colleagues and to their constituents. I do not think the rule, as I have heard it described, is an adequate amount of time, and so I want to make that statement, because I support the request that has been made by the whip.

HOUR OF MEETING ON SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1997

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1997, TO SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1997

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday, November 8, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Sunday, November 9, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DESIGNATE TIME FOR RESUMPTION OF PROCEEDINGS ON REMAINING MOTIONS TO SUSPEND RULES CONSIDERED MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to designate a time not later than November 9, 1997, for resumption of proceedings on the seven remaining motions to suspend the rules originally debated on September 29, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 101) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 101

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106(3) of Public Law 105–46 is further amended by striking ''November 7, 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''November 9, 1997'', and each provision amended by sections 122 and 123 of such public law shall be applied as if ''November 9, 1997'' was substituted for ''October 23, 1997''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 101 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the second fiscal year 1998 continuing resolution expires tonight. Currently, 7 of the 13 appropriations bills have been enacted into law and two others are pending at the White House. We have just adopted the conference report on the Labor-HHS bill, leaving three appropriations bills left to finish in the House. Because these remaining bills will not be enacted into law by tonight, it is necessary now to proceed with an extension of the current short-term continuing resolution so that the Government can continue to operate.

The joint resolution now before the House merely extends the provisions of the initial continuing resolution until November 9, or for 2 more days, while we wrap up our work. The basic funding rate would continue to be the current rate. We retain the provisions that lower or restrict those current rates that might be at too high a level and would therefore impinge on final funding levels. Also, the traditional restrictions such as no new starts and 1997 terms and conditions are retained. The expiration date of November 9 should give us time to complete our work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the joint resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I frankly have misgivings and mixed feelings about this continuing resolution. People who know me know that I have a black Irish soul and that I often worry about the downside of life, but even I, until 2 days ago, was very optimistic that we would be able to get out of here with all of our work done on the appropriation bills without the need for a continuing resolution. Indeed, up until 2 days ago, I think we were on that track.

□ 1900

But then something happened, because all of a sudden the flexibility which we thought we saw on the part of that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle all of a sudden seemed to disappear, and now we have heard disturbing rumors about the linkage of fast track legislation with the remaining appropriation bills. And I must say that I find it disconcerting to go into a conference on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill today and to discover that the conferees are being told that they must begin the conference without knowing what the language is that we will be asked to vote on issues such as the census, for instance.

Now, I happen to be in a peculiar position. I have supported the Republican Party position on the issue of sampling on the census, but it is apparent to me that there is a deal or near deal between the Republican leadership and the White House on that language, and yet rank-and-file Members on neither side of the aisle have so far been given access to whatever that language is.

Now, regardless of one's position on the issue, Members have a right to know what it is, and it seems to me that we would not have this CR before us if games were not being played. We were, in fact, told that one Member of the leadership today indicated that the language on the census could not be made public until the vote on fast track because it would, quote, cost votes on fast track.

Now, I do not know which side of the aisle is likely to be sold out on that issue, whether it is our side of the aisle or their side of the aisle, but somebody apparently is, and it seems to me that what is happening is very simple. These other appropriation bills are being stalled out in terms of our getting any full information until fast track votes have been achieved.

Now, that greatly complicates the appropriations process, it greatly adds to the mistrust in this place, and it is, in my view, the only reason why we even have this CR before us tonight. The issues on appropriation bills were easily resolvable before they became linked to the fast track train, and it just seems to me that rank-and-file Members need to know that we are in the position of needing yet another CR not because of any failure of the Committee on Appropriations to do its work, or certainly not because of any failure of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or to see to it that these appropriations bills are done, but simply because people at higher levels are linking things that ought not be linked, and, as a result, this committee once again is prevented from doing its business in a timely fashion.

I find that very much regrettable and very much not in the public interest, and I am tempted to call a roll call on this because of that, but in the interests of accommodating the Members who would finally like to get out of here, and get a decent meal, and get some sleep, I will withhold. But I do not think Members ought to be fooled. There is very clearly linkage that certain parties are trying to establish on these issues, and I think that is unfortunate because it gets in the way of our ability to deal with these bills straight up and on the square.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Wisconsin prepared to yield back the balance of his time?

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of staff throughout the House and my own desire to end this long week and engage in further discussions on additional bills tomorrow, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the order of the House today, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, the previous question is ordered.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

DESIGNATION OF HON. STEVEN C. LATOURETTE TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE ON TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker: