

has stated, that we take time to memorialize those who have played significant roles in our lives.

As a fellow resident of Maryland, along with the gentleman and, of course, the man who we honor with this legislation, J.J. Chestnut, I think what we send out to the world is a memorial which will be there for a very, very long time that says to the world that he was one who gave his life so that others might live, bringing a hope and a sense of dedication to the area in Maryland where this post office is.

Also, I want to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN). Throughout this entire unfortunate situation, the gentleman was there with the family. He constantly made it clear that he would do everything, and did do everything that he could to uplift the family.

I think that one of the most fitting things that could possibly be done is this way of memorializing this great man. So, when people come into that post office and see that name there and know that he is one who stood up for us, and for many when they could not stand up for themselves, and even the children who will come in and say who is that man? Who was he? For some person to be able to say that was J.J. Chestnut. He was an officer with the Capitol Police and he gave his life so that others might live, I think that that will be a very, very fitting memorial.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the entire House support this wonderful, wonderful resolution and ask that all of my colleagues vote for it.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX).

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) has brought forward. It is very fitting legislation. Officer Chestnut was someone well-loved in this Capitol, who represented the finest in law enforcement and certainly he is an individual who we will miss as a result of his tragic murder that took place here in the Capitol.

This individual represented the best in law enforcement. His family and his friends certainly miss him greatly. We all do. The Nation does. But to have, therefore, a post office named in his honor is certainly appropriate. It is certainly a small token of the affection, respect, and admiration that all of us here in the Capitol and across the Nation felt for Officer Chestnut.

Many officers come to this institution and have a chance to serve their Nation. Officer Chestnut was so near retirement. He had brought to many people the opportunity to see their Capitol firsthand. He was professional. He was a policeman's policeman; one

who was well trained, who dealt with the public in a very friendly, professional manner. He really was the best of the best.

So, having this post office be named for one of our own who was one of law enforcement's best is a symbol, a reflection of this House and this Congress saying "thank you" to a great man whose life was cut far too short.

We join with the family and friends and the men and women in blue all across this country who have lost one of their own, who stood up for us all the time, and who make a real difference for this country. This is certainly a unanimous vote that should be the forthcoming result, and I am sure the Senate and the President will agree that this is certainly a tribute that is appropriate and I hope that the House will join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) in making this a unanimous vote.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, with a final word of praise to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and great thanks to him, I urge all our colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4516.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, when called up; and that it be in order at any time to consider the joint resolution in the House; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that the joint resolution be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; and, that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request just agreed to, I called up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) making further continuing appropriations for

the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The text of House Joint Resolution 133 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 133

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106(c) of Public Law 105-240 is amended by striking "October 9, 1998" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 12, 1998".

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).

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

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 H. J. Res. 133, 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. Speaker, today the initial continuing resolution for fiscal year 1999 expires, so we need another continuing resolution. Not all of the appropriations bills have yet been enacted, and for that reason we do need a little extra time to complete our business.

Adoption of H.J. Res. 133, which runs from tonight through October 12, will give us the time we need to complete our remaining work.

I am disappointed I have had to bring this joint resolution to the floor. I really thought that it was possible that we could get our bills done by tonight, but evidently we have run into some roadblocks and we need a little bit more time.

The negotiations are proceeding. There are tough issues yet to be settled. I appreciate all parties for having participated to the degree that they have. But I hope they understand that we need to knuckle down and do a little bit more if we are going to finish the job through the end of this particular continuing resolution which expires on Monday.

I was a little taken aback by the press conference by the President a little while ago suggesting that the Congress is not intent on doing our business. As you know, Mr. Speaker, both Houses have been diligently working on the budget ever since the President came to Congress and requested approximately \$9 billion over the budget agreement that he agreed to last year, which ultimately led to balancing the budget this year. He requested \$9 billion more than he had agreed to last

year and we have been doing the best that we could to meet the caps, the budget caps that were put in place by that budget agreement.

It would appear now that the President wishes us to exceed those budget caps with the promise that he has certain unidentified offsets for any monies that might be expended in excess of those caps. And yet to this moment, Mr. Speaker, to this very moment, despite our requests since July, I have not seen those offsets.

Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly requested from the administration day after day, week after week, month after month to give us a sneak peek at the offsets that they might provide for us, so that we might know if we spend more than the budget caps agreed to by the President. We will offset that amount and the budget agreement that the President engaged in last year will not be broken, will not be breached.

To this minute as I stand here, I still have not seen those budget offsets. And so it concerns me when I turn on the television a little while ago and see the President of the United States standing in the Rose Garden surrounded by Members of Congress from the other side of the aisle saying that we have not met his prerogatives and he is going to hold the Congress here until we meet his demands.

We would love to meet his demands, but all we ask is to let us see these offsets which pay for the amount that he wishes to expend in excess of the amount that he agreed to in his budget agreement with us that led to the balanced budget that we all reached last year.

I am hopeful, I am deeply hopeful that we are going to be able to see those budget offsets some day soon. Maybe even today. But just a few minutes ago, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget said that he wanted to wait until the end of the process before he showed us his offsets.

Well, I think the time for Kenny Rogers to step up to the table and say, "You've got to know when to hold 'em and when to fold 'em" is long since past. The time is to put the cards on the table, and we have not yet been able to get the administration to do that. So, we have not really been able to get an agreement yet.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry about that. I apologize to all the Members of this body that we have not concluded our business. I am hopeful and optimistic that we will be able to do so by Monday. But I want to say to all of my Members, all of my colleagues throughout Congress, we are going to stay here. We are going to stay here until we conclude the people's business. We will stay as long as it takes to finish our business, pass our appropriations bills, live within the budget caps, the agreement that the President and the Congress made last year.

When we conclude our business, we will go home and get elected. Until then, I am afraid that we may be here

with another continuing resolution, and that grieves me greatly. I would like very much not to have to say that. But to think that just a few minutes ago the representatives of the President of the United States would not show us the offsets that they intend to use to pay for any spending over and above the budget caps that the President agreed to a year ago is absolutely astounding at this late hour.

So, I have no choice but to come here and request this continuing resolution.

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

□ 1700

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the gentleman from Louisiana and I are good friends. We are an awful lot alike; we are both very placid individuals. Neither one of us ever gets excited; neither one of us ever gets mad; and we are always the quietest, most calm people in the place.

Let me simply say that I have enjoyed listening to my friend's speech, and he is doing his duty in bringing this extension of the continuing resolution to the floor. But I kind of feel like Yogi Berra. This is *deja vu* all over again. And I think we really do need to understand why we are here and what the practical steps are that must be taken if we are to get out of here in a reasonable length of time.

This House has had sort of a schizophrenic history the last 2 years on appropriations bills. Last year, I thought we had a very good year, and I thought that both parties could genuinely be pleased about what was produced in the appropriations process. After the fight over the government shutdown several years ago, where my friends on the other side got badly burned because they thought they could shut the government down to force the President to cave into their priorities, and they were proven wrong, in reaction to that, last year, I thought they behaved quite responsibly. And, as a result, we had a bipartisan approach to virtually every appropriations bill except one. And at the end of the process I thought we all felt pretty good about ourselves and about each other.

But when this year's appropriations cycle began, it was apparent that the majority leadership was in a new mode, and they were telling the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations on the other side of the aisle that they wanted them to adopt a more confrontational mode so that they could more clearly define the differences between the two parties. The press has written about that. I have been told that, frankly, by a number of Members on the other side of the aisle.

So, as a consequence, what has been the track record? The track record is that this Congress never did produce a budget. We are now through the entire fiscal year, and we still do not have a budget. We also have very few bills

that have gone through the entire process. I think only two of them have been signed, one has been vetoed, and the rest are still stuck in the Congress somewhere.

One of the reasons for that, in my view, is because the leadership on that side of the aisle in this House decided that they wanted to try to pass a series of appropriations bills with only Republican votes. And so, for instance, on Labor, Health, Education, they produced a bill which is some \$2 billion below the President's on education; they eliminated the Low Income Heating Assistance Program; they eliminated Summer Jobs; they shredded the President's education initiatives; and they produced a bill which was so extreme that their Republican brethren in the Senate would not accept that bill, and that bill has never even been finished by either body. Finally, yesterday, that bill came to the floor, and then we simply had a brief debate on family planning and then that bill was pulled from the floor.

Now, we do not run this place; the other side does, because they are the majority. I recognize that. But when the other side follows a policy of confrontation rather than cooperation, they have to expect that we are going to have problems. And so now we are stuck. No budget. Almost no appropriations bills passed. Fiscal year gone. We have already had one continuing resolution and now we have yet another one. I would predict for my colleagues that this is going to have to be extended again.

Members in this House need to understand there is not a chance of a snowball in Hades that we can possibly reach all of the agreements that have to be reached and have a bill to the floor on Monday. I have talked to a number of our friends in the press, and they seem to have been told that there were only 9 or 10 items that separated us. We still have over 300 items that have to be resolved, in numbers and in language. And that is a practical fact. That means that we are going to need every second of this extension and then some, in my view.

I would just ask that we recognize that while the majority party controls both Houses of the Congress, and it is their right to produce a bill that can only be passed with Republican votes, they must understand that if they want those bills to become law, they do need a Presidential signature, and that means there is going to have to be compromise. We are going to have to find common ground. And, until we do, we are going to be stuck here. I hope we can find that common ground sooner than later, but it is going to be very difficult.

With respect to the chairman's comments on offsets, offsets are simply what is produced in order to pay the bill. The check comes after we know what the bill is. Well, until we know what the differences are between parties, and until we know the size of

those differences, it is pretty hard to say how we are going to pay for them when we do not even know what the differences are. So what we have to do, with all due respect to my friends on the other side, we have to sit down and lay out what our differences are so that we know rather than are guessing about how the other feels, and then we can proceed to try to bridge those differences.

I hope we can be here early next week with a resolution to these bills, but we are a long way from settlement. And as the President said in the White House, we are not going to leave, we are not going to leave until this Congress is responsive to the President's education initiatives and we have those funded to considerable measure. And that means that we had better start recognizing that right now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As the gentleman has said, the process is to work between the bodies on the Hill and between the parties in this body and the other body to work out our differences, and, of course, work with the White House to try to achieve some degree of compromise to where the bills can be signed. And that is exactly the process that we are in and have been in for several weeks now.

As far as knowing what the White House offsets are going to be so that we can know where the money is going to come from to pay for these extra frills that the President seems to want, we simply want to know what the cost is going to be and where the money is going to come from. When we go shopping at the store and the store shows us the goods that we would like to buy, they have to know that we have got the money to pay for it before we can strike a deal.

And so we simply want to see the White House's money. If they have a way to pay for the frills that they are asking for, then that is a different story. But until this time they have simply refused to tell us whether or not they have the money to pay for the frills that they want to add to these bills.

Now, we are in the process of working differences out between the bodies and the White House. That process is ongoing. The budget office from the White House has been here now for several days meeting with the leadership in the Congress, the Speaker, the majority leader, and the leaders of the minority party in both bodies. We are in the process of negotiating and working. We simply have not had time to meet the demands of the White House at this point in time.

And I would urge that the White House be reasonable in their requests. We are trying to be reasonable. We are trying to find ways to do what the White House would like to do on all these bills. They are being a bit unreasonable at this point in time, and we

simply are going to stay here until we get this job done.

Now, the White House can take their campaign trips wherever they want. This body, this House, is staying in session until we get the job done.

□ 1710

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic Whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and giving me some time to talk about the lack of a budget.

Madam Speaker, here we are. We are 9 days past the end of the fiscal year. We are passing another short-term budget because the Republican leadership has failed to do its work. We have no budget.

If we were running a business and we were entering a new year, we would have a budget to follow so we would know where we were going, what we were going to spend, what income we were going to take in, how we were going to make our ledger work.

A family would have a budget so they knew how to take care of their housing needs and their children's education and all of the things that are important.

We are not talking about some small entity here. This is the Federal Government. We have no budget. For the first time in 25 years, there is no budget. And only 6 of the 13 spending bills have been passed. Excuse me. Six have not been passed.

So what have we been doing here for, 10, these many months since the President came and talked about issues of concern to the country in the State of the Union address?

Have we dealt with the minimum wage so that people who work 40 hours a week can earn at least a poverty level wage? They do not now. They did not do that. The Senate a couple of weeks ago voted against that. The Republican colleagues killed that in the Senate.

How about campaign finance reform to clean up our system? Did not do that in the Senate. They killed that one, too, after squandering months on it in the House not wanting to take it up.

How about teen smoking for the health of our children? What did we do there? Zippo, nada, nothing.

How about HMO reform, a patients' bill of rights so that when someone wants to see a doctor they can see a doctor. So that if someone needs a test they can get a test. So if someone has an emergency they can go to the closest hospital? They killed it in the Senate today in the other body.

So this Congress has basically done nothing on the issues that the American people care about. We have no budget.

And my colleague on the other side of the aisle, who I respect, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), talks about frills, how are we going to pay for the frills?

I just was handed a definition of "frills" because I was on my way to the dictionary which sits in this Chamber next to the Speaker's podium, and they define frills as a trimming, as a strip of cloth or lace gathered at the end, a ruffle, something superfluous.

Let me tell my colleagues what kind of frills we are talking about and then decide whether or not it is superfluous. We are talking about education, and we are talking about reducing our class size in America so that our children can get a good education, so that there can be discipline in the classrooms and our teachers can teach, and we have a bill that we have advocated for months and months and months, and they have said no and no and no to it. That is the frills we are talking about today.

Or how about this frill? How about taking care of the schools in this Nation that are falling apart, where the plaster is falling down and the plumbing does not work or our children are getting educated in trailers outside the main building, where the heat does not work sometimes? Is that a frill?

That is why we want to stay here, so that we can take care of those issues that we came here to take care of.

They have closed the door to a good wage for people already. They closed the door on patients' health reform, a patients' bill of rights, reforming HMOs today. They closed the door on doing something about teen smoking and health care in this country, and now they talk about education reform as frills.

We have no budget. This, in my opinion, has been the worst, most unproductive Congress that I have been involved with in my 22 years here. Oh, it has done a lot of investigating, but when it comes to the people's business, the business that the people talk about around their kitchen tables, nothing, and then we get it called frills.

Madam Speaker, I hope in the next week, and I suspect we will be here for a week, I cannot imagine that we will get 300 items taken care of, because that is what is in disagreement, as the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) mentioned, 300 pieces of disagreement on these appropriation bills, in numbers and in language.

I hope in the week or so that it takes to get this done we will elevate the education issue to where it belongs in this country so that our children will get the respect, the dignity and the resources that they need to be able to compete in our world.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), whatever he calls the additional spending the President has requested, he has yet to tell us how he is going to pay for it. I mean, the budget agreement that the gentleman agreed to, the President agreed to, under which we are operating, sets caps for spending.

We are spending up to the caps. Now the President says disregard the caps; give us more money for X, Y and Z.

Well, we cannot consider that until we know how we are going to pay for it. Where are we going to cut spending in order to increase spending for something else so that we stay under the overall caps, under which this Congress operates and the White House agreed to and is operating?

Now, as to whether or not there is a budget resolution, it makes not a hill of beans' difference. We are operating under the budget agreement that the parties and the White House agreed to a couple of years ago. We are spending in the appropriations bills every penny of those caps. Whether or not we have a budget resolution is irrelevant, because we agreed back in June, without the budget resolution, that we would spend up to the caps. We cannot spend more than the caps unless we change the law. So what difference is it if there is not a budget resolution, which only is an internal paper of the Congress anyway?

So we are spending all of the caps that we are allowed to spend under the budget resolution, the budget agreement, that the White House signed off on and now wants to violate.

I want to ask the White House, how come they want to violate the balanced budget agreement that led to the Nation's first balanced budget in 37 years and which they are so big about crowing about on television? Why do they now want to violate that balanced budget agreement?

As long as there is a refusal to come up with the offsets to spend more in one category than we agreed to, it simply is a hollow demand.

□ 1720

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on my time. He is asking what the administration will do to pay for its initiatives. The Speaker is asking that we spend at least \$8 billion in additional funding for the Pentagon, in addition to the bill that we just passed through here 2 weeks ago.

Where are you going to get the money to pay for that?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will yield, I assume that the Speaker has suggested the offsets with which to pay for it. That is the way this place has to operate under the balanced budget agreement.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman assumes wrongly.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, this debate is almost hilarious. My colleagues on the other side say there is no budget. But each appropriations bill we have in the balanced budget has a cap. Every appropriations bill has a budget in it, all 13 of them. There is

your budget. And in every case, every single case except one that the liberals always want to cut is defense, and our national security is the lowest it has been in 30 years. That is your cash cow. In every single one. You say, well, education. Your party over 40 years has screwed up the education program to where we are 15th in the industrialized nations in math and science. We are last in literacy. And for the first time we have taken the 760 federal education programs so you can rein down your excessive money and limit it and get the money to the classroom. Instead of 50 cents on the dollar, we are going to get 90 cents on the dollar down to the classroom.

You call us extreme. Well, yesterday's fiasco, so that you can generate your base, we are trying to lead the country based on the Constitution and here you are with a gimmick to try to generate your base. And now you are over at the White House saying, Mr. President, we need to spend more, we need big government, we need to tax more, and do you think we are going to stick around and let you do that? We are going to stick around, but we are not going to let you get away your liberal spending, liberal tax and liberal bigger government. Absolutely not.

I feel sorry for my colleagues on the other side. They look at the polls and they know that many of them are not coming back next term. The only thing they can do is sit here and demagogue and push the White House to spend more money. We are not going to let you do it. Because the American people know exactly what you are trying to do.

When you say education, what about the children, well, what about Davis-Bacon? We could have waived Davis-Bacon for construction on schools in D.C., Mr. Bonior, and your union bosses preferred union bosses instead of children, instead of building and putting roofs on our D.C. schools.

Let us call it like it is. You talk about increasing education. The money that is in there for education out of the President's budget is not there. It is above it. And the only way he can increase it is to take it out of the surplus. And you take it out of the surplus, I do not guess you want to take the surplus and put it into Social Security anymore. I guess you have changed your mind. Because of all these great spending programs you have, you want to keep spending and spending and spending. You cannot have it both ways. You have got to adhere to a balanced budget that the President signed which you on the left do not want to do. I feel sorry for you. Because not many of you are coming back.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. The gentleman says that the Democratic Party has screwed up education. I guess that means that he feels we should not have passed the Nation's student loan programs which we would not have had without a

Democratic Congress. I guess that means he feels we should not have Pell grants that helped the kids from working families go to college and technical school. I guess that means he feels that we ought to repeal handicapped educational legislation. I guess that means he feels we ought to repeal Head Start that is the main program that we provide so that kids who are having trouble learning to read and deal with mathematics get a decent start in the early grades on that. The gentleman may think that that is screwing up America. I think it is creating opportunity for every working family in America.

On this side of the aisle, we make absolutely no apology in being for that kind of spending. In contrast, in the last 3 years, this Congress has added \$20 billion to the President's defense budget but \$17 billion of the \$20 billion has gone for pork rather than readiness. I will compare and debate those priorities anytime.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. It is interesting that the Republicans who spent months and months trying to get a budget, then when they cannot get a budget, they say it does not amount to a hill of bean, that it makes no difference to the American people. Then why did you spend all those months in the Budget Committee trying to hammer out a budget? You say it does not matter that the appropriations bills are not done yet. But why did you spend all this time trying to do it?

The fact of the matter is you have an ideological fight going on within the Republican Party within the right wing and the far right wing and you cannot resolve it and you have not been able to do the American public's business. You have not been able to do it.

Most of the businesses in America are increasing their productivity. Workers all across America are increasing their productivity. People are making investments in productivity. The Republican Congress is working less every year. Every year. You lost a month this year. Last year we worked 132 days. This year we worked 106. You have lost a month. Two years ago you worked more days. You have lost 2 months in 2 years. At this rate we will be the most unproductive workers in America. You cannot get a budget, you cannot get appropriations bills, you could not get a tobacco agreement, you have not been able to reform HMOs, you cannot deal with crumbling classrooms in this country, you cannot deal with getting more teachers in the classrooms because of a teacher shortage, and yet you are getting the same pay. But you have lost 2 months in 2 years' time. If you worked for any corporation in America, either you would shut down your corporation, you would

reinvent your corporation, or you would go out of business. Name another entity in this country that lost 2 months in the last 2 years in worker productivity. American workers are working harder than they have ever worked before for their wages and the first thing that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) suggests is that we take away their wages in Davis-Bacon, that we take hard-working Americans and his answer to the budgetary problem is to take away their wages. That is outrageous. Those people are working 8 and 10 hours a day. They are working 6 and 7 days a week. The Congress is coming in on Wednesday and leaving on Thursday, the Congress cannot show up after its August break until the middle of September, and it is ready to go home in October and it is not coming back until March. That is a hell of a job we have got here, ladies and gentlemen. The only problem is you have not done your work. Anywhere else in America, you would be fired. You would be fired, because you failed to show up and go to work every day like every other American.

So what has happened? So we have said no, this Congress, to 100,000 teachers for our children. We have said no to our children who are in crumbling classrooms, where \$12 billion worth of work needs to be done to make those classrooms safe. We have said no to America's children for afterschool programs that the police departments tell us all the time they need to help us fight crime after school between 3 and 6 in the afternoon. You have said no to the people who want to submit the patient-doctor relationship, you have insisted that we are going to continue to let the insurance companies get in between patients and doctors who need that kind of care. You have said no to the tobacco settlement so we can get back to the Medicare system the money that was stolen from them because they had to deal with the tobacco ailments of the American public from smoking after being deceived by the tobacco companies.

This is the most unproductive Congress in the history of this Congress. If we keep losing the days of work like this, pretty soon we will just show up in January, collect a year's pay and go home, because according to you, it makes no difference whether we have a budget and appropriations. It makes a difference to the American people because the reason you do not have a budget is you do not want to admit what you have not done.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. Apparently the gentleman does not believe that a balanced budget is important. This Congress achieved a balanced budget for the first time in 37 years. Apparently the gentleman does not believe that cutting taxes to the American people is important. This Congress cut people's taxes. Apparently the gentleman does not believe that having the best econ-

omy in decades is not important. We believe it is. This Congress created the atmosphere in which we have got the best economy in decades. The gentleman apparently does not believe that having record employment is important. We believe it is. Under this Congress's policies we have had record employment for the last several years ever since this party has been in charge.

□ 1730

We believe this Congress has been productive on the important matters for all of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, listening to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), it reminds me of Harry Truman's statement. Some complained that Harry Truman was giving them hell; he says, "No, I just tell them the truth, and it sounds like hell." Harry Truman also coined the do-nothing Congress.

Now the bad news here is that the extreme right has taken control of the agenda here. We find ourselves through this session not dealing with the budgetary matters, health care, education. We spent half a day on the floor trying to take away health care from people in California. We go after ethnic groups and try to divide this country based on their national origin or their heritage. When it comes to education, we ignore it. Pension reform; we will not deal with it here.

CHRIS DODD and I sat in a meeting in Norwich, Connecticut, where a gentleman died of a heart attack because he was so frightened about the situation of his family because the HMO was in the process of dropping them. Can his family, can other families turn to this Congress? No. This Congress is too busy, too busy to take care of people's health needs.

In my district and across this country there are a quarter of a million seniors who are losing their health care and million others that are frightened. We are here sitting around taking up pieces of legislation that have no life-and-death significance, but not HMO reform. Our colleagues might get somebody with a big corporate contribution angry, so there is no HMO reform, there is no help for seniors who are losing their health care.

What I saw what government did as a kid: Members came to Congress so they could be an advocate for those without power, not the insurance companies, not the major corporations. Members were there to make sure the average person had a voice for their troubles.

And then, of course, campaign finance reform. Our colleagues control the House and the Senate. They have always been the reason that campaign finance reform has not passed, filibus-

tered in the Senate, vetoed by President Bush. Now, they could have written any bill that they choose to. They killed campaign finance reform along with health care and pensions and education.

Madam Speaker, our colleagues ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Kentucky for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I would say the debate is somewhat enlightening, except there seems to be far more heat of that aforementioned four-letter definition that my friend from Connecticut mentioned a second ago than any light. We could sit here and retrace history. We could ask why during 40 years of liberal control campaign finance reform to deal with so many problems was never really taken up. We could talk about the fact that true health care reform to protect the doctor-patient relationship rather than the patient-trial lawyer relationship has been championed in this body. We could talk about the fact that for the first time in 16 long years, this common-sense conservative Congress offered tax relief to working Americans.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, I am struck by the irony of the other side who always would cast themselves as defenders of working Americans, and yet time and time and time again reached into the pockets of those working Americans to take their wages and send them here to Washington.

Madam Speaker, our common-sense policies have drawn a clear choice and contrast because we are intent on transferring money, power and influence out of the hands of the bureaucrats. We are intent on making sure that working Americans hang onto more of their wages so they have more to spend on their own families rather than sending those wages here to Washington. That is the real change, and to the extent that we continue this proven record of success with a balanced budget, with tax relief for Americans, with a bold plan to ensure the sanctity of the patient-doctor relationship, we are proud to take our time to debate our differences and to achieve that balanced budget.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman would not yield. I asked him several times. Perhaps he would answer this question for me.

The gentleman talked about wages and standing up for working people. Is the gentleman in support of increasing the minimum wage, the minimum wage bill that we have? Or is the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman is in support of cutting taxes for working Americans.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, the gentleman will not answer that question, so he obviously is not in support of raising the minimum wage for people who work for less than poverty wages, and that ought to be recorded and understood by the people who he represents.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would also remind the gentleman from Arizona, he says that when the Democrats controlled Congress, we did not take up campaign finance reform. The fact is we passed campaign finance reform three times in this House. I was the sponsor of it on two occasions. He says that we did not do much to help senior citizens. All we did under the Democrat watch was to pass Social Security, to pass Medicare, two programs that the gentleman's Speaker has spent a lifetime trying to destroy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and reserve the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I listened to what the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) said, and the problem I have is not only with the substance of what he talked about, but the fact that effectively what he has proposed and what the Republican leadership has done is to just waste time, and that is why we are here in this dilemma tonight where they have to pass continuing resolutions, and they cannot get the budget done, and they cannot get the appropriation bills passed because basically they just wasted the Congress' and the American public's time.

The gentleman from Arizona talked about HMO reform. They had no intention of passing HMO reform. Democrats in committee, in the Committee on Commerce and other committees, on the floor, constantly asked that the Patient Bill Of Rights be brought up for a vote and be considered, the Democratic proposal. It was never considered. They just took 1 day, they passed an HMO bill that basically reformed nothing, that was worse than the status quo, and they knew it was not going to go anywhere. They sent it over to the Senate. The Senate never took it up. The Democratic leadership in the Senate tried to take it up today and was denied. There was no intention to pass HMO reform, just to waste time.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) talked about tax cuts. There was no intention to pass a tax cut. This was just an exercise in futility. They were taking the money from the Social Security Trust Fund. They knew it was never going to pass. It

passed the House, it went over to the Senate, they knew the Senate would never take it up. The President vowed he would never sign it. They did not even intend to pass a tax cut really. They were just wasting time.

And we have seen this over and over again, wasting time on appropriations bills, all these antienvironmental riders that will wreck our natural resources that eventually most of them they had to take out.

This whole debate over education, they did not care about public education. They spent days, weeks talking about vouchers, taking money from public schools to give it to private schools. But they did not even intend to really pass that either. They were just wasting time.

That is why we are here today, because this Congress essentially does nothing under the Republican leadership but waste time. They do not want to do anything to help the American public. Just some benchmarks: The least number of days that this Congress has worked in decades, the least number of bills enacted in decades, and, finally, the failure to pass a budget for the first time since the budget process was created.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, I am absolutely astounded at the comments that just preceded me. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) obviously is engaged in a tough political race back home, and he has brought rhetoric to the floor of the House. Unfortunately it is only that, has no bearing, no relationship to the truth whatsoever.

The fact is if he would have checked the record, if he had been around here in that campaign, perhaps he would know that we passed the Higher Education Act, the Reading Excellence Act, the school nutrition bill, the vocational technical education bill, a quality Head Start bill, a charter schools bill and legislation to provide new technology to the people with disabilities.

□ 1740

The fact is that he would know that in the Labor-Health bill now being discussed with the President's people today, the Congress has approved roughly \$32 billion.

The differences between the President's position and our position is less than \$600 million, maybe as low as \$300 million. In many instances, the Congress, the Republican Congress has appropriated more than the President asked for, specifically on the issue with respect to the special education where the President did not ask for the sufficient amount of money that was already authorized by Congress in previous years.

Just about an hour and a half ago, the President's people came to us with what we thought was a good faith negotiation to resolve all our differences and get Congress out of session by the

end of the continuing resolution tonight, which we are now trying to extend till Monday.

As late as today, October 9, they came to us with no paper, no spreadsheets, no documentation for what they were asking for, and they have been saying to us since July that they were going to provide offsets, that they were going to provide for legislative cuts to offset the additional spending that the President has requested throughout the last several months, and that they have still to this moment, to this moment not given us the first sheet of paper or the first indication of what those offsets in some black box happen to be.

The fact is if we are dealing in a good faith effort with the opposing party, both sides, at a late date like this, the last days of the legislative session, should put their cards on the table and stop jockeying politically.

But as it was noted by the speaker that just proceeded, all they are interested in is politics and in posturing. They are not interested in actually sitting down and getting the people's business done. I regret that. I regret that.

I am prepared to stay here as long as it takes to get this business done, to get these bills appropriated, to make sure that the money is available for the people that really need it, but make sure that we live within the budget caps that the President himself agreed to last year when he came up with an historic balanced budget agreement with the Congress that led to the first surplus in the American treasury in 30 years, 30 years, Madam Speaker.

I think it's very, very important that we separate the wheat from the chaff, that we separate the political posturing like the speaker that preceded me. Understand, we are going to finish the people's business.

But in order for us to reach a good faith agreement with the administration, with the President of the United States so that we can resolve all of our differences, we have to know what their position is. We have to see their paper. We have to see their request. We have to see the extra money that they want to spend it on, and we have to know where that money is coming from. Until we get it, we are just talking in the dark.

I think it is time to stop talking in the dark. Get real. Put the politics behind us and get the people's business done.

Mr. MURTHA. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want the gentleman to know I have been watching the debate; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is coming across as reasonable. I do not know what is going on.

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

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of touting over there about the fact the administration is not offsetting some of the items it is asking for us provide.

I see in the National Journal's Congress Daily the fact that the Senate majority leader is asking us to spend \$385 million in so-called emergency funding to bail out ConAgra and Tyson's and other big chicken exporters who, on the private market, ship chickens to Russia and now cannot find a buyer.

So when we start talking about declaring something as an emergency, I did not realize it was an emergency that we would bail out big business when they make a bad detail.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very patient and hard-working, intelligent, dynamic gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I had no intention of coming to the floor and engaging in this debate, but I really believe it is important from time to time for people to come maybe to the center of this institution and put things in somewhat of a perspective as we prepare to go home at the end of the 105th Congress.

I have been here 4 years and have grown to deeply and passionately, not only love this institution, but love people on both sides of the aisle.

When I hear people like the gentleman from California come here and make statements about people not doing their job and not working hard, I want the people to know, everybody in this institution that I know have works their tails off.

When my 11-year-old son and my 9 year-old-daughter watch these proceedings and know how much time I spend away from them and how busy I am and everybody in this institution, this institution means more than either one of our political parties. It must be held up. If not, the cynicism in this country is going to grow.

I strongly encourage Members on both sides to say what they mean and mean what they say and quit using words that demean this institution. It is not in our best interest. It is not to our children's best interest.

What is in their best interest is to know that we all work hard and do our very best for the people that we represent. We should debate the issues, but to use shallow rhetoric about this body not having done its job last year or this year, I have been here 4 years. I have seen people work around the clock from both sides of the aisle. Four hundred thirty-five people work, from my perspective, as hard as they possibly could.

I worked with my friends on the other side of the aisle on campaign finance reform. I tried not to come down here and run my mouth if I did not have something to say that was a value to this process.

Please, for the sake of this government, for civil government, for decency, for cooperation, for the next Congress and the next Congress and

Congresses 100 years from now, quit using shallow rhetoric.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I wish we had heard that same speech yesterday.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, let me paraphrase Admiral Stockdale, a former vice presidential candidate: "Who are we, and why are we here?"

It is clear that the Republican leadership of this House has no idea who they are and certainly do not know why they are here. They do not know why the people of this country sent them to represent their interests. This Republican-led Congress has failed the American people.

We have passed the end of the fiscal year, and what have they accomplished? The Republican leadership has not passed the budget. They have not completed appropriations. We only have a few days left before this Congress adjourns, and they refuse to address the issue that the American people care about.

Let us talk about the missed opportunities. Social Security reform. Instead of doing that, they would raid the Social Security Trust Fund and not preserve and protect Social Security for the future.

Tobacco legislation. Three thousand kids in this country start to smoke every single day, and 1,000 will die. But, no, we could not do something about tobacco legislation.

Real managed care reform. About getting doctors and patients to make the decisions, the medical decisions in their lives instead of insurance companies. No. We had bipartisan support in this body. We could have passed it in a heartbeat. If the Speaker of this House wanted to get it passed, we could have done it at a moment's notice.

Let us talk about minimum wage and raising the living standards of working families in this country. No, we could not do that.

Campaign finance reform. Certainly let us not reform this House. Let us not do that.

They have failed to take any action to strengthen our public schools, reduce class size, make sure we have 100,000 new teachers in the classroom, modernize our schools so that our kids get wired up to the Internet and they can succeed in their future.

□ 1750

No, none of these we could do.

Let me just say, the American people deserve to know why we are here. We are here to represent their interests. We have a few short hours in this session of the Congress. Let us do something about our school system; let us pass legislation that is meaningful to the people of this country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Louisiana has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, this Republican Congress has been a failure. We have spent a lot of time, yes, on investigations and millions of dollars on investigations, but not making a meaningful difference in people's lives.

Madam Speaker, we have a balanced budget and a Federal surplus because of the Democratic deficit reduction program, yet my colleagues are 9 days overdue on a budget for America. No mayor, no Governor, no American family could do the same. My colleagues have failed families in this country in giving them protection from HMO abuses. My Republican colleagues have failed seniors by making sure that Social Security comes first in the context of the budget surplus.

Madam Speaker, we Democrats do not want to let you go home and fail our children. We want to put 100,000 teachers back in the classrooms of this country to help educate our children and modernize our schools. If we have billions of dollars for tax cuts, we can have some money for the Nation's children that are going to make us competitive in the next century.

Democrats will not let you leave and go home and campaign; we will stay here and work and make sure, we are going to ensure, that you do not commit the final failure, which would be failing our children.

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

I was prepared to close, but evidently we are going to have continue to have rhetoric that sometimes compels me to answer.

I left the floor a little while ago to take care of some very important business, and when I returned I was advised that one of the speakers on the other side took this political rhetoric to such an extent that he talked about a campaign rally, or a town meeting at which he was present, and an elderly gentleman talked about HMOs and got so excited that he fell down and died, and for some reason that was supposed to be our fault.

I heard the last speaker say that we have deprived America of all of the good that the President wishes to bestow upon them, and I just get concerned about the rhetoric. I just asked my friend from Arizona there, does he have any thoughts about how heated this rhetoric gets?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I think we could do with a lot more

light, and a lot less heat. I think it is unfortunate when members of the minority, and we can understand that different people have different philosophies and that we should exchange those, but to have reason and, to a certain degree, passion replaced by a sad rhetorical device to imply that anyone's policies on this floor led to the death of an individual I think is highly regrettable.

I would hope that those on both sides of the aisle would rethink that type of rhetoric, because again, it has no place in this Chamber. Indeed, given the standards that many have applied to the conservative side of the aisle, I would hope that they would offer the same scrutiny to such unfortunate statements that come from the other side.

The bottom line is this: We can work together in the framework of what we did last year, balancing the budget for the first time in a generation; offering tax cuts to working folks for the first time in 16 years; and I would hope that all of the poll-driven rhetoric and all of the passion-driven examples that are highly regrettable would be left outside the Chamber.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Because of our efforts, we now have a balanced budget, \$70 billion in surplus. Because of our efforts, we have the lowest interest rates in a generation. Because of our efforts, our children have a future which, hopefully, if we can get our way, will be free of undue taxation and free of undue interference from Washington, D.C. That is our goal. That is our hope. That is our platform. We are prepared to run on that at any time.

But to be accused of inciting conditions that caused the death of an American citizen frankly goes beyond the pale. I am really surprised that that was used in the rhetoric here on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I hope to close this debate soon.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the suddenly moderate gentleman from Arizona for his pieties, and I would simply like to say that I love this institution, and I respect many, many Members in it. And I revere what this institution is supposed to mean to each and every citizen of the country. But in the last analysis, I think they are going to be impressed much less by our pieties and by our rhetoric than they are by our actions.

It seems to me if we really want to inspire the American people, we will take action in the next week, as we make our final decisions on the budget, a budget which, after all, does define

what our values are, and as we make those choices, I hope that the choices that we make will indeed help to make a difference for struggling working families who need every bit of help they can to make education affordable, to provide decent classrooms for kids, to provide decent teacher-student ratios so that kids have a chance to learn in the poor school districts as well as the wealthy school districts in this country.

I hope that in the area of health we will recognize that every American has a right to full access to health care, just by virtue of the fact that they were born one of God's creatures; and I hope that we will recognize our obligation to strengthen people's retirement security, and I hope we will recognize our obligation to drop the innumerable attacks on the environment that we see in appropriation bills that threaten the future environmental health and safety of this country.

So I would urge Members to vote for this simple extension of time so that this very tardy Congress can get its work done.

I make no criticism of the gentleman from Louisiana in this. I think we have said many times, if all of these issues were left to us to work out between the two of us, I do not think there is an issue that we could not solve. But unfortunately, there are many pressures above our pay grade which have often interposed themselves and made it very, very difficult for our committee to reach the same kind of accommodation that we were able to reach last year, and that is why we stand here tonight with still so much work to be done, and with still so many public needs to be met.

I would hope that in the time that we have remaining and the time that is provided by this resolution will help us indeed to put people first.

□ 1800

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his comments. I do agree with them. I think if he and I were left to work out all of the problems that divide us, we could be through and be out of here tonight. However, unfortunately, there are others involved in the process. It has been a long calendar, both in the calendar year 1998 and in 1997, that comprised the legislative agenda for the 105th Congress.

I happen to think we have accomplished a great deal. I know my friend might quarrel with that, but we have managed to roll back taxes, we have cut regulation, we have passed a balanced budget agreement, in conjunction with the President.

We have expected the President to adhere to the requirements of that balanced budget agreement, and I think one of the reasons we stand here to-

night is because the balanced budget agreement has not been adhered to by the President. As I noted earlier, the President signed that budget agreement.

We have set caps for the discretionary spending, that which goes through the appropriations process for departments, agencies, and programs. Last year we knew that we were on a glide path that would be difficult to meet, and the President in fact did not meet it, but he expected the Congress would pass tobacco taxes and all sorts of additional taxes and user fees to meet his additional agenda that he proposed in February when he addressed us in the State of the Union speech.

We do not have that extra money. We would expect the President to come to us early in the process and say, if we do not have that extra money, here is how I expect to get some of my other initiatives fulfilled. Certainly that is a negotiating process. We would never expect the President to get all of his initiatives fulfilled, any more than we would expect to get all of ours imposed upon him in an equal negotiation, but we have not had an equal negotiation.

We have had our cards on the table for days, weeks, months. The President knows, his people know where we are on appropriations bills, and just only 2 hours ago came to us and said they are still not going to give us their offsets, and they are going to parcel out the extra items for spending that he has targeted. That puts us in a tough position.

I would say that it is time to put the politics behind us. I would rely on our accomplishments. My friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) has given me a long list of fiscal accomplishments which I think is so good I would like to include them in the RECORD at this point.

The material referred to is as follows:

TOP TEN FISCAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(1) Most families with children will save \$400 in taxes per child in 1998 and \$500 thereafter. That amounts to over \$100 million dollars in each congressional district that the taxpayers get to keep.

(2) Most families with children in the first two years of college will be able to use money for college expenses that otherwise would have gone for taxes and can now set up educational savings accounts whose profits are tax free.

(3) Most Americans who buy and sell stocks, or who sell a piece of real estate, will save considerably on their taxes.

(4) Most Americans who sell their principal residence won't have to pay one dime of capital gains taxes.

(5) Many children of farmers and small business owners who want to inherit their parents' property and businesses will pay less or no death taxes.

(6) Small business owners will be able to deduct a greater share of health and accident insurance premiums, and be able to write off a greater amount of money for new equipment.

(7) Young people will be able to save easier for a down payment on their first home by our creating a new IRA.

(8) Stay at home spouses will no longer be discriminated against because we changed the IRA laws to allow them to participate.

(9) People can save \$2,000 a year in retirement IRAs paid for by after tax dollars so that every cent earned is tax free at retirement.

(10) In 1993 President Clinton gave us the biggest tax increase in history, but now most Americans have received a tax cut and a Balanced Budget Act that will stop deficit spending and pay off the national debt.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope Members understand that it is important that we complete our business, that it is important that we finish the appropriations process, that we work out a mutually agreeable negotiation with the President and his representatives, that he sign the appropriations bills, either within their individual context or within an omnibus bill, gathering those bills left unattended, and that once signed, we can complete the work of this Congress and go back and campaign for reelection.

I do not have an opponent this year. I am happy to tell the Members that if we cannot get the President to give us his numbers and show us his cards and enter into a negotiation, I am prepared to stay here.

I know that is going to inconvenience a lot of Members, Republican and Democrat. I do not think that the vast majority of Members want to stay here past tonight, let alone Monday or next Friday or next month, but if necessary, it will not bother me. I will just be here. I will just plug along.

I hope that one day, whether it is today or tomorrow or Sunday or Monday or next week, one day, that the representatives of the Office of Management and Budget will say, okay, here is what we want and here are our offsets, and here is how we are going to pay for it. We will take this, they will take that, we will wrap it all up, get the President to sign it, and we will go home.

If not, I will just stay here. We will not close the government. We are not going to have any shutdowns. We are just going to keep on plugging and do our business. If the President wants to posture in the Rose Garden, I will go run upstairs into the press gallery and I will answer his posturing. If he wants to get down to business, we will roll up our sleeves and we will get down to business. Hopefully, that is what we will opt for. We will in fact complete the people's business. We will do it soon. That demands that we first vote for this continuing resolution.

We are not going to be able to complete our business tonight, unfortunately, but we might, we might successfully complete our business by Sunday or Monday, at the latest. That is why we are asking for this continuing resolution to be passed and signed into law, to give us the time that we need to do our job, working with the White House and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. That is why I ask for a yes vote on this three-day continuing resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The joint resolution is con-

sidered as read for amendment, and pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam 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 421, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]
YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Chabot	Farr
Ackerman	Chambliss	Fattah
Aderholt	Chenoweth	Fawell
Allen	Christensen	Fazio
Andrews	Clay	Filner
Archer	Clayton	Foley
Armey	Clement	Forbes
Bachus	Clyburn	Ford
Baesler	Coble	Fossella
Baker	Coburn	Fowler
Baldacci	Collins	Fox
Ballenger	Combest	Franks (NJ)
Barcia	Condit	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Conyers	Frost
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Furse
Barrett (WI)	Cooksey	Gallegly
Bartlett	Costello	Ganske
Barton	Cox	Gejdenson
Bass	Coyne	Gekas
Bateman	Cramer	Gephardt
Becerra	Crane	Gibbons
Bentsen	Crapo	Gilchrest
Bereuter	Cubin	Gillmor
Berry	Cummings	Gilman
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Danner	Goode
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Goodling
Bilely	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Blumenauer	Deal	Goss
Blunt	DeFazio	Graham
Boehkert	DeGette	Granger
Boehner	Delahunt	Green
Bonilla	DeLauro	Greenwood
Bonior	DeLay	Gutierrez
Bono	Deutsch	Gutknecht
Borski	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Boswell	Dickey	Hall (TX)
Boucher	Dicks	Hamilton
Boyd	Dingell	Hansen
Brady (PA)	Dixon	Harman
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Hastert
Brown (CA)	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hayworth
Bryant	Dreier	Hefley
Bunning	Duncan	Hefner
Burr	Dunn	Herger
Burton	Edwards	Hill
Buyer	Ehlers	Hilleary
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hilliard
Calvert	Emerson	Hinchesy
Camp	Engel	Hinojosa
Campbell	English	Hobson
Canady	Ensign	Hoekstra
Cannon	Eshoo	Holden
Capps	Etheridge	Hooley
Cardin	Evans	Horn
Carson	Everett	Hostettler
Castle	Ewing	Houghton

Hoyer	Menendez	Scarborough
Hulshof	Metcalf	Schaefer, Dan
Hunter	Mica	Schaffer, Bob
Hutchinson	Millender-	Schumer
Hyde	McDonald	Scott
Istook	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Minge	Sessions
(TX)	Mink	Shadegg
Jefferson	Moakley	Shaw
Jenkins	Moran (KS)	Shays
Johnson (CT)	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Johnson (WI)	Morella	Shimkus
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Sisisky
Jones	Nadler	Skaggs
Kanjorski	Neal	Skeen
Kaptur	Neumann	Skelton
Kasich	Ney	Slaughter
Kelly	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (MA)	Norwood	Smith (OR)
Kennedy (RI)	Nussle	Smith (TX)
Kildee	Oberstar	Smith, Adam
Kilpatrick	Obey	Smith, Linda
Kim	Olver	Snowbarger
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Snyder
King (NY)	Owens	Solomon
Kingston	Oxley	Souder
Kleczka	Packard	Spence
Klink	Pallone	Spratt
Klug	Pappas	Stabenow
Knollenberg	Parker	Stark
Kolbe	Pascrell	Stearns
Kucinich	Pastor	Stenholm
LaFalce	Paul	Stokes
LaHood	Paxon	Strickland
Lampson	Payne	Stump
Lantos	Pease	Stupak
Largent	Pelosi	Sununu
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Talent
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Lazio	Petri	Tauscher
Leach	Pickering	Tauzin
Lee	Pickett	Taylor (MS)
Levin	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Thomas
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Thompson
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Thornberry
Linder	Portman	Thune
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Thurman
Livingston	Quinn	Tiahrt
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Torres
Lofgren	Rahall	Towns
Lowe	Ramstad	Trafficant
Lucas	Rangel	Turner
Luther	Redmond	Upton
Maloney (CT)	Regula	Velazquez
Maloney (NY)	Reyes	Vento
Manzullo	Riggs	Visclosky
Markey	Riley	Walsh
Martinez	Rivers	Wamp
Mascara	Rodriguez	Waters
Matsui	Roemer	Watkins
McCarthy (MO)	Rogan	Watt (NC)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers	Watts (OK)
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
McDade	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
McDermott	Roukema	Weller
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
McHale	Royce	Weygand
McHugh	Rush	White
McInnis	Ryun	Whitfield
McIntosh	Sabo	Wicker
McIntyre	Salmon	Wilson
McKeon	Sanchez	Wise
McKinney	Sanders	Wolf
McNulty	Sandlin	Woolsey
Meehan	Sanford	Wynn
Meek (FL)	Sawyer	Young (AK)
Meeks (NY)	Saxton	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Berman	Manton	Smith (MI)
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Tierney
Inglis	Nethercutt	Yates
John	Poshard	
Kennelly	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1824

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.