

Consequently the committee recommends that the House adopt the resolution dismissing the election contest.

□ 1030

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. As was stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, the task force met and heard oral arguments from the counsels for both parties and in a later meeting voted unanimously to dismiss the contest.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the contestant's allegations were that the rights of absentee voters were deprived by acts of election officials and that the contestee did not receive a majority of the votes cast in this election. Additionally, the contestant raised certain other allegations of irregularities in the Guam election process.

First, the allegation was made that the low rate of return of the ballots was because the first ballots were not mailed to the absentee voters until October 16 and that the mailing of the absentee ballots were not completed until October 31. Therefore, there was not enough time to complete and return the ballots in a timely manner. Counsel for the contestee presented the task force with an affidavit from the employee of the Guam Election Commission who spoke with the Postal Service representative who had advised her that if the absentee ballots were sent out by October 21 and if they were expeditiously returned by the voter the ballots should be back in time to be counted in the general election. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the absentee voter was advised several times within the absentee mailing to return the ballot immediately.

The contestant's second allegation that the contestee did not receive a majority of the votes cast. They contend that the "majority" must be computed to include ballots cast that were marked for both candidates—overvotes—or neither candidate—blank ballots. Further, the contestant believes that the absentee ballots which were postmarked prior to November 6, but received after the close of the polls are "votes cast."

Mr. Speaker, there was a similar case decided in 1982 in an election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands. The court was faced with the issue of whether blank and spoiled ballots should be counted in determining the majority of the votes cast. In the *Totman versus Boschulte* opinion, the Court quoted an earlier decision (*Euwema v. Todman*, 8 V.I. 224 (D.V.I. 1971)) which stated that "The proper basis for computing a majority" was that "voters not attending the election or not voting on the matter submitted are presumed to assent to the expressed will of those attending and voting and are not to be

taken into consideration in determining the result." Additionally, the Guam Election Commission legal counsel advised the commission of a legal opinion written 2 years ago that blank ballots and those with voted too many should not be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is necessary to take any more of the House's time on the resolution and would urge its adoption.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING SPECIAL BUDGET PROCEDURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That, for the purposes of the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as they apply to the House of Representatives, the Congress shall be considered to have adopted H. Con. Res. 152, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1985 and setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, as adopted by the House on May 23, 1985. For the purposes of this resolution, the allocations of budget authority and new entitlement authority printed in the Congressional Record of July 23, 1985 by Representative Gray of Pennsylvania, shall be considered as allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344).

Sec. 2. This resolution shall cease to apply upon final adoption by the House and the Senate of a concurrent resolution on the budget for the applicable fiscal year or years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTAL], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules reported House Resolution 231, providing special budget procedures for the fiscal year 1986 congressional budget process. This is a matter of original jurisdiction for the Rules Committee. House Resolution 231 provides that the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, House Concurrent Resolution 152, will be considered to be adopted by the Congress for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act, as it applies to the House of Representatives. House Resolution 231 states that the allocation of spending totals among House committees printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 23, 1985, by Representative GRAY, chairman of the Budget Committee, will be considered as the allocation required by section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the two Houses agree on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, the provisions of House 231 would cease to apply.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Act was created in order to allow Congress to set some overall limits on spending and revenue and to set priorities for the way that funds would be spent. To make sure that these limits have some real meaning, that all of the pain we go through in adopting a budget resolution actually will help to control spending and revenues, section 303 of the Budget Act provides that spending and revenue legislation cannot be considered until Congress has agreed on those overall limits in a budget resolution. You cannot very well enforce limits on spending if you have already spent most of your money before you decide on those limits. Of course, the Budget Act also requires that the budget resolution be adopted by May 15.

But here we are on July 24, with no budget resolution agreed to. I am a member of the conference committee on the budget, and I can assure you that we have tried mightily to produce a budget agreement, but so far it has been beyond our power. I still hope that we will reach agreement, but we do not have one now and I cannot honestly say that one is just around the corner.

This means we are faced with a dilemma. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer to move forward with consideration of the 13 general appropriation bills and other spending legislation. If we delay any longer, we are simply insuring that the Government will be funded by a massive continuing resolution. The business of the Government must move forward at some point, even if we have not been able to

agree to a budget resolution. On October 1, funding for most of the Government stops, regardless of the status of the budget resolution. On the other hand, we cannot afford simply to throw up our hands and surrender to the \$200 billion deficits facing us and give up the constraints provided by the Budget Act.

The resolution before us today offers a compromise solution to this dilemma. The solution is not perfect. A perfect solution would be that we have a budget resolution in place which eliminates the deficit. But this resolution allows the House to move forward with the business of providing funds for the Government, while imposing the constraints of the only budget resolution we have: The budget passed by this House on May 23. This resolution will allow the appropriation bills and other spending bills to move forward without waivers of the Budget Act, but it will activate all of the enforcement provisions of the Budget Act to ensure that these bills stay within the limits that this House agreed to in its budget resolution.

If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the regular scorekeeping procedures will be set in motion. Members will have the information necessary to compare spending bills with the overall spending totals in the House-passed resolution. Chairman GRAY printed in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the allocations of new budget authority and new entitlement authority among House committees. The House committees, pursuant to section 302(b) of the Budget Act, will subdivide their allocations among their subcommittees or by program and report these subdivisions promptly to the House. The Appropriations Committee has this morning made available a tentative version of its 302(b) subdivisions. The subdivision to be provided today is necessarily tentative because the Appropriations Committee has not had sufficient time to meet and formally approve it. It is my understanding, however, that the final subdivision is not likely to be significantly different.

House Resolution 231 would also set in motion the reconciliation process. In effect, House Resolution 231 gives force to the reconciliation directive included in the House Resolution 231 gives force to the reconciliation directive included in House Concurrent Resolution 52, the House-passed budget resolution, which instructs 10 committees of the House to report reconciliation legislation not later than 30 calendar days after final action on the resolution. If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the 30-day clock begins running today.

Adoption of this resolution will also bring into effect the Budget Act constraints on total spending and on revenues. In accordance with section 311 of the Budget Act and the provisions

of the House-passed budget resolution, beginning October 1, 1985, a point of order will lie against any measure that would cause the spending totals or revenue floor set in House Concurrent Resolution 152 to be breached.

Mr. Speaker, House Rule XLIX provides that a joint resolution changing the debt limit shall be deemed to have passed the House if Congress adopts a budget resolution which recommends a change in the statutory limit on the debt. The resolution we are considering today does not trigger this procedure. If House Resolution 231 is adopted, the House-passed budget resolution will be deemed to have been adopted by Congress for purposes of the Budget Act, but not for purposes of House Rule XLIX.

To date, Mr. Speaker, three general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986 have been considered and approved by the House. Three more have been reported by the Appropriations Committee and are awaiting consideration by the House. Therefore, out of a total of 13 general appropriation bills, only three have cleared the House and three more are pending.

With the start of the next fiscal year on October 1, 1985, and an intervening congressional recess during the month of August, it is apparent that we are far behind in our annual appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a predicament. The budget conference is stalled. The House must act on appropriation measures but the House should not act without the constraint and guidance offered by a budget resolution. This is our situation. I wish it were not. The best we can do, I submit, is to use the House-passed budget resolution to get the ball rolling on reconciliation, to put in motion the regular scorekeeping procedures, and to place overall limits on spending. That is what House Resolution 231 does. I urge its adoption.

□ 1040

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say I rise in opposition to the resolution.

In our discussion on this issue, I think we ought to start by being honest about the nature of the resolution itself. It is, in effect, a waiver of the Budget Act. Let us get that straight. More specifically, it has the effect of waiving the requirements that final action be completed on the budget resolution before the House may proceed to consider general appropriation bills.

This resolution eliminates certain Budget Act restraints on not just one, not just two, not just three, but all—all—the general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986.

House Resolution 231 does all this by providing that the first budget res-

olution for fiscal year 1986 as passed by the House will be considered to have been adopted by both Congress and the Congress. If we once accept this pretense that a budget resolution has been agreed to, then there is no need to waive points of order for lack of a real budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this a blanket waiver of section 303(a), the Budget Act requirement that a budget resolution be in place before appropriation bills can be considered, but for the first time this year, it actually would permit spending increase amendments to be offered to general appropriation bills.

Under current procedure, even though the House may waive section 303(a) of the Budget Act against individual appropriation bills, such waivers do not cover amendment. So under current procedure, amendments cutting spending may be considered, but amendments increasing spending violate the Budget Act requirement for a final budget resolution before new spending may be considered.

However, if this resolution is adopted, there will be no prohibition under the Budget Act remaining against amendments which increase spending. This may result in moving the House toward larger deficits rather than reducing deficits. Even if the House should manage to hold the line against spending increase amendments, the fact remains that many of the so-called savings in the original House-passed budget resolution are suspect at best.

To lock the House into this position would be to run up the white flag on achieving more meaningful, real savings in its ongoing negotiations with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, to adopt this resolution now removes much of the incentive to reach a budget agreement with the other body. We should be trying to encourage agreement, rather than making it easier to get along without any final budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this resolution is a vote for more, not less, spending and I oppose the resolution and ask my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

As one of the conferees on the budget, let me finish my remarks by setting forth some of the differences between the House and the Senate on these issues.

As the figures will indicate, the House must come up with some hard cuts, and reconciliation instructions which will produce results. These are several areas of disagreement on real cuts. We have to get back to the negotiating table with the other body, make these real savings, get away from any puffery, and there has been some admission that there were some, on both sides—not only on this side in

the Democrat budget, but in the other body, and get this budget resolution in place.

I have heard many speeches this year and in past years about how important it is to have a budget resolution, and I believe it is important to have a budget resolution. But the only way to get a budget resolution is to get concurrence with the other body and to come to some agreement on the differences. I think the time is short for getting an agreement.

We have to lay aside some of the differences, think only about the future if we do not come to some resolution of this problem.

Let me first ask this question of the Members of this House: Without a budget resolution, are you prepared, as early perhaps as the first of October, to be voting on an increase in the debt ceiling to as high as \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion? That is the forecast from the Treasury Department.

I think time is late for action, and this problem deserves action. We have to be prepared in the House to make cuts in our favorite programs, and we hear about them all the time. You cannot say you cannot cut this or that, but for gosh sakes, reduce the deficit. We have to reduce the deficit, and the only way to do it is in those programs that are your pet programs.

□ 1050

No one has said during this conference that we ought to be touching the so-called poverty programs or the needs-tested programs. We have laid those aside. We have laid COLA's aside. We have taken half the cuts out of defense in the House-passed budget, and defense only represents a third of the total budget. So for any Member to come down in the well and attempt to argue, as we have heard the last few days, that we have got to take more out of defense shows a lack of knowledge of what has already been accomplished. We have got to start touching those programs which are sensitive to the Members of the House.

The time to act is now, but not the way we are proceeding here this morning by passing a resolution to waive the Budget Act on all of the appropriations bills.

I raised this question yesterday before the Rules Committee: What would be the scenario if we come back with a budget resolution and we had passed appropriations above what is called for in that budget resolution? Nobody came up with the answer. Are we going to have to repass them? Are we going to have to lay them aside? What are we going to do? Nobody seemed to have the answer.

But we are about to pass a general waiver of the Budget Act. I think if we have to have a waiver on these appropriation bills, we ought to be taking

them up one at a time, not doing it with one sweep.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a table showing the differences between the House and Senate budget figures, as follows:

HOUSE OFFER VERSUS SENATE BUDGET: MAJOR DOMESTIC CATEGORIES

Program	Senate savings in excess of House		House offer (Senate savings)	
	1986	1986-88	1986	1986-88
Hard program savings:				
COLA's:				
1 Social Security COLA.....	6.0	22.0	0	0
2 Other COLA.....	1.7	6.3	0	0
3 Subtotal.....	7.7	28.3	0	0
Hard program savings: Non-COLA's:				
4 Civilian/military retire- ment:	.5	5.9	0	.5
5 Medicaid.....	.3	1.2	0	0
6 Child nutrition.....	.4	1.4	0	0
7 WIN/CSA.....	.3	1.7	0	0
8 Food stamps.....	.3	1.0	0	0
9 Training/health grants.....	.3	2.0	0	0
10 Student aid.....	.1	.5	0	0
11 Other poverty programs.....	.1	.6	0	0
12 Medicare.....	.1	2.3	0	1.4
13 Exam direct loans.....	.2	2.2	.1	.8
14 SPRO.....	.5	1.9	.2	.6
15 Postal subsidy.....	.7	2.3	0	.2
16 Highway programs.....		1.4	.1	.9
17 Amtrak.....		.3		.1
18 Veterans health care.....	.1	1.2	0	0
19 CSL.....	.02	.9	.1	.7
20 Veterans housing.....	.2	.7	0	0
21 EDA, ARC, UDAG/ HODAC:	.1	1.0	.1	1.1
22 SBA.....	.2	1.3	.2	.7
23 Job Corps.....		.3	0	0
24 Mass transit.....	.2	1.45	.1	.6
25 Sec. 108.....		.2		.2
26 CDBG.....	0	0	0	.5
27 Rural housing.....	.8	3.2	0	0
28 Subtotal.....	5.6	35.6	1.0	8.3
29 Grand total, hard savings:	13.3	63.8	1.0	8.3
Soft savings and bookkeeping:				
30 Farm programs.....	1.4	4.8	.3	2.0
31 Superfund.....	.3	1.9		.3
32 Public housing debt for- giveness.....	1.6	4.7	1.6	4.7
33 Public housing finance reform.....	.5	2.2	.5	2.2
34 FEHB reserves.....	.2	.1	.5	.8
35 4 percent non-DOD work force cut.....	.5	2.0	.5	2.0
36 Administrative cut.....	.6	1.9	.6	1.9
37 Rural housing asset sale.....	0	0	.6	2.7
38 Unspecified transportation savings.....	0	0	.3	1.6
39 Unspecified function 500.....	0	0	.1	.5
40 Law enforcement freeze.....	0	0	.1	.4
41 Subtotal.....	4.7	17.6	5.1	19.1
42 Grand total, domestic in Senate.....	18.0	81.4	6.1	27.4
New House proposals:				
43 Nuclear electric user fee.....	0	0	.3	1.1
44 Higher grazing fees.....	0	0	.1	.2
45 State and local new hires (SS). Eliminate PILT.....	0	0	.2	2.0
46 Mineral lease revenue sharing.....	0	0	.1	.3
47 Subtotal.....	0	0	.6	1.8
48 Bridge to House offer as reported:				
49 Hard program savings.....		1.0		8.3
50 Soft savings/bookkeeping.....		5.1		19.1
51 New House proposals.....		1.3		5.4
52 Drop 1986 revenue sharing.....		-.9		-1.2
53 Other small items.....		-.2		-.5
54 Gross House offer.....		6.3		30.1
55 Drop contracting out.....		-.39		-12.3
56 Debt service adjustment.....		-.17		-.51
57 Net House offer.....		.7		12.7

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposed rule to implement the House-passed budget resolution.

Although I am still working to reach agreement with the Senate conferees on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, I believe that the House must take immediate steps to implement its own budget. The House is firmly committed to a budget-reduction figure of \$56 billion in deficit reductions this year, and this message can never be delivered too strongly to the other body or to the American people.

What is being asked here is not a waiver of the Budget Act but a strong enforcement of the Budget Act. The House has made some tough decisions. We have made real cuts, and in our last offer to the Senate we offered \$24 billion in additional cuts. Yet our offer was rejected.

This weekend we have heard four different targets coming from the other body and from the White House. We heard \$28 billion, we heard \$50 billion, we heard \$70 billion, and we have heard \$80 billion.

While the other body and the White House are trying to come together and get a target, we have to continue with the orderly business of this Nation. That means bringing forth the appropriation bills in order to meet our deadline at the end of this fiscal year. All this resolution does is simply allow us to continue that orderly business, allow the appropriation bills to come forward, and also let the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle know that those appropriation bills are under the House-passed budget. Thus, there is a 302(b) allocation that is published, as well as 302(a) allocation.

So in essence we are not waiving the Budget Act. We are simply saying that we need to move judiciously and efficiently in the House legislatively, and what we are doing is establishing a mechanism to do that in light of the fact that we do not have a conference report. As soon as we have a conference report, it will supersede the House-passed budget, but until then this mechanism will allow us to proceed with appropriation bills and have published in the RECORD 302(a)'s and 302(b)'s so that Members will know that each of the appropriation bills is under the House-passed budget.

It is important for us to do this for two reasons. First, let us remember that last year, because the other body had another problem, we did not get a conference report until October. Thus we had to pass several appropriation bills, and often Members asked, "Can

we tell for sure that these bills are under the House-passed resolution?" The answer was, "No, you cannot tell for sure because we don't have a published 302(b) allocation."

Second, I would also remind the Members that last year, besides not getting a conference report until October, often Members were put into the position of voting for appropriation bills, and then those very same votes were used against them to imply that they broke the budget every time they voted for an appropriation bill. By voting for this House resolution, all you are saying on both sides of the aisle is that this is the budget until we have a conference report, and thus we will have a published report and know exactly where each of these appropriation bills stands in relation to the House-passed budget which was bipartisanly passed this spring.

So I would urge my colleagues to recognize that this is not waiving the Budget Act. This is enforcing the Budget Act. This is showing once again that we in the House are committed to achieving over \$50 billion of deficit reductions, and if we get a conference report, we will work to implement that as well. And this chairman stands ready to go back to the conference table with the Senate as soon as they convene. But again I remind the Members that the targets keep moving.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I fear that this procedure that we are about to vote on is one more nail in the coffin of the budget process. I really hate to see that because I think that the budget process that we set up under the Budget Impoundment Act is a good idea and one that I would like to see work. It has not worked very well in restraining spending, but I would like to see us keep working at trying to make it a success.

□ 1100

Now, as far as the argument that these appropriation bills are under the House-passed budget resolution, so is the sky. I mean, there is no restraint, in my opinion under the House budget resolution, so it is not very impressive when you are told that it is under the House budget resolution.

There are a lot of angles to this budget that I would like my colleagues to consider and I will just mentioned a few of them.

I remember, though, Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln used to pose the riddle, "If you call a tail a leg, how many legs does a horse have?" And when the answer would inevitably come back, "five legs," Lincoln would

respond: "No. A horse would still have four legs. Calling a tail a leg doesn't make it a leg."

I would suggest to my colleagues that this resolution suffers from the same problem. It tries to call the House-passed budget resolution the "congressional budget." But calling it so doesn't make it so. We're just horsing around with this gimmick—pulling everyone's leg, and spinning tales. And why are we going to all this trouble? Mainly so we don't have to waive the Budget Act every time an appropriations bill comes to the floor. This resolution provides a blanket waiver of the Budget Act—one, big horse blanket.

Mr. Speaker, my majority party colleagues on the Rules Committee, in collaboration with the majority leadership, have presented us with a convenient little procedure that will spare us waiving the Budget Act piecemeal as we take up spending bills. Moreover, they will argue that by adopting this resolution we are somehow preserving orderly process, and especially the budget process and the discipline that goes with it.

Unfortunately, all those representations are just plain false. This does not preserve the congressional budget process; it gives formal recognition to a new House budget process. It says, "the other body be damned; full speed ahead." You will note that this is not a concurrent resolution on budget procedures; it is a simple House resolution.

Does this preserve the discipline of the budget process? Yes and no. This will trigger the reconciliation process. Our committees that are subject to reconciliation instructions will have to report their bills within 30 calendar days. This will also kick in the overall spending limit on October 1.

But, on the other hand, this resolution will also permit amendments to be offered to appropriations bills to increase spending—something that cannot be done under existing procedures without a specific waiver of the Budget Act against amendments. So consider the fact that during this crucial stage of the appropriations process, you will be authorizing spending increase amendments by adopting this resolution.

Also consider the fact that by adopting this resolution you will be taking the pressure off the conferees to work out a final budget resolution. Why should they? This gives them everything the House voted for.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me caution my colleagues to think before you vote. Think about what this resolution really does. Think about the precedent you are setting in converting the congressional budget process into a House budget process. Think about the harm you are doing to bi-

cameralism and budgetary compromise by calling the House budget a congressional budget. Think about the damage you are doing to the prospect of achieving real savings in the area of \$50 billion if you threaten a House-Senate compromise on a savings package and settle for the limited savings in the House-passed resolution that the other body might agree to.

I would submit that when you get done thinking about these larger issues, you just might be willing to join with me and set aside the temporary comfort and convenience this resolution might offer, and stick with existing procedures. We already have a budget process. Let's make it work. Defeat this resolution.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Assuming that the gentleman is concerned about the deficit, jobs in Mississippi and jobs in America, I make that critical assumption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If that is true, the deficit being critical, how would the gentleman reduce the deficit? The gentleman is not for Social Security cuts, he is not for any cuts in defense, he is not for any new taxes. I just ask the gentleman, as a responsible legislator with whom I share much in common and of whom I have a high regard, it seems to me that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is trying to put a budget on the House floor. What might we do constructively to help that?

Mr. LOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question.

First of all, under the agreements that have been tentatively reached, I think we have already agreed to defense spending reductions in excess of \$22 billion, and where we make those savings are in nondefense discretionary domestic appropriated accounts across the board, freeze them across the board. There are a lot of them that could be eliminated or cut further.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to move in that direction and I think the conferees can make progress; but let us not take the pressure off them to make that progress by passing this resolution.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, with regard to taking pressure off the conference, in fact this does just the opposite. It puts pressure on the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has again expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that just the opposite is true. Today there are reports in the media that the Senate is talking about not operating with a budget at all in 1986. The other body is talking about no budget.

Mr. LOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to respond to that particular point, that information is not correct. My colleagues in the other body are going to work further with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and make progress.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Well, I hope that is true, but it seems to me that what we are doing in this simple resolution is putting in place a mechanism so that we can show clearly that we are prepared to enforce the savings in the House budget until such time as we get a conference report.

I want the gentleman to know that I want to keep the pressure on. I think this is the mechanism to keep the pressure on, because it says that the House is going to achieve over \$50 billion worth of savings and the Senate, I am hopeful, will be able to do that, so I would simply say to my colleague that it does not take the pressure off.

Mr. LOTT. Well, what kind of pressure is it when we say, "All right, Appropriations, go ahead and do your deal and we will worry about the budget resolution later"?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Well, let me just give the gentleman the answer by going to the opposite. You have to approve individual waivers.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, made a comment a moment ago about another nail in the coffin of the budget process.

I would only point out to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, that as a member of the conference committee on this matter, I can tell the gentleman that it is the other body that has broken off the negotiations,

that it is the other body that has proceeded to apply nails to this particular matter, not this body. It is the other body that has refused to come back with another offer at this point.

I hope that they will. I hope the other body will come forward this week, but I do not think that we can point the finger at Members on this side of the aisle or this House for having broken off the negotiations on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several points to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi.

One. This is a matter of sunshine which Members on both sides of the aisle have sought from time to time, letting everyone know what is happening in the budget process. This resolution would do just that. You would have the 302(a) allocations, the 302(b) allocations, so that Members on that side of the aisle, as well as some Members on our side of the aisle who are concerned about what is happening on these individual appropriation bills would be able to look at those allocations, compare the appropriation bills and make their points during the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out, as was observed during the debate a moment ago, that this resolution permits reconciliation to go forward and that is very important.

Now, there is some difference of opinion about the amount of reconciliation, whether we should have an "X" figure or a "Y" figure, but the point is that reconciliation, once this resolution is adopted, then could begin, which is very important to enforcing any budget resolution in the House this year.

This is a constructive approach. It permits the House to move forward in a reasonable way to enforce a budget. It is something that should be adopted today.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Appropriations reported the fiscal year 1986 appropriation bills, three bills, for Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, and Treasury-Postal Service.

All we needed at that time to bring these bills to the floor of the House was a waiver of section 303 of the Budget Act for each of the bills and the necessary waivers for lack of authorization.

What we got, instead, was a round trip to political Disney Land, courtesy of the majority leadership. Although the conferees have been unable to agree on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1986, this rule solves that problem by the convenient fiction that Congress "shall be considered to have

adopted" the budget resolution which passed the House.

This has to be the most arrogant imposition on public credibility that I have seen in the last 27 years that I have been in the House, and I hope that the Members of the House will reject this rule here today.

Do we really believe that the public is so gullible that we can simply pass a resolution which says that the Congress has adopted a piece of major legislation, when as a matter of public record we have not? If so, why stop here with the budget resolution, I ask the gentleman from Louisiana?

If we are going to take this ultimate congressional junket to political Disney Land, why not dispose of all of our pending business?

We could legislate by a simple resolution. Think of the possibilities.

We could resolve that the conferees on the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 have met and agreed on a budget resolution which provides for a balanced budget through fiscal year 1990, and that this budget resolution has passed the House and the Senate.

We could resolve that the House and the Senate have passed, and the President has signed, a reconciliation bill which makes the changes in entitlement and authorizing legislation needed to implement a balanced budget through 1990.

We could resolve that the House and the Senate have passed, and that the President has signed, all authorizations and appropriation bills outstanding for the fiscal year 1986, which will be consistent with a balanced budget.

We could resolve that the House and Senate have passed, and the President has signed, a tax reform and simplification act, which provides for further reductions in individual tax rates and is revenue neutral and eliminates all unfair tax preferences in the Internal Revenue Code.

□ 1110

We could do that, believe me, if we could do this.

Finally, we could resolve that the first session of the 99th Congress has adjourned until January 3, 1986. What a blessing that would be.

This rule is an insult to the credibility of this House, to the intelligence of our constituents, and we should vote it down.

I see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] who is interested in doing away with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, as I am. If you vote for this today and it passes, there is no longer any need for the Interior Committee to go to the Rules Committee to get a rule waiving points of order against

section 302(b) or section 303. And there is no way, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] that I think that you will be able to join me in an amendment zeroing out the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Not only him, but the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] and all of the others who oppose the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and want to zero it out.

You are working right into the hands of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and all of the others who favor the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. And I hope that you are listening, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] because there is no way in the world that you are ever going to be able to get rid of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. We could kill the rule here today and the Interior Committee would not have to come back to the Rules Committee. They can bring the bill right here because they do not need any waivers.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is confused. We will have to come to the Rules Committee for a rule even though this passes and our Interior rule is voted down. We still will have to come to the Rules Committee for waivers of legislative matters.

We will not have to come to the Rules Committee on the question of waiving the requirements of the Budget Act.

Mr. CONTE. That is optional. That is optional and many, many subcommittee chairmen, I remember the gentleman from Iowa [NEAL SMITH] last year, I think it was, in the State Justice and Commerce bill came here without a rule, and they did raise points of order against those parts of the bill that were not authorized, and they were knocked out.

Mr. YATES. I have considered that possibility. The problem is that several of the legislative committees have not passed bills that will authorize major programs, and we would still have to come to the Rules Committee in order to get a waiver, in order for those very important Departments in Government to keep operating.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to joining with him in a moment, of course, in the battle against the rule on the Interior appropriation bill.

But first, may I say that I think that the issue just raised with respect to the budget rule before us now, that issue is a red herring. There are many, many other reasons why the Interior

Appropriations Committee or other committees will have come to the Rules Committee beyond the Budget Act, and that is simply a nonissue.

Mr. CONTE. That is a question of judgment by the subcommittee chairman. They have done it many times, they have come here without a rule, and they can do it again.

If you are interested in doing away with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, you will vote down this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for yielding this time to me.

I must say as to my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, that as a Member of the Appropriations Committee one could expect that he would oppose this resolution. But to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio and the other Members on the other side of the aisle, I am surprised that they are opposing this resolution, because this resolution once and for all shows that we in the House are serious about the budget, are serious about the deficit and are trying to do something about it.

Can we go all the way as far as the Senate and the White House want us to go on domestic programs? Probably not. But are we trying to go a good part of the way? Yes, we are.

And we are saying we are going to do that whether there is a budget resolution or not. I would remind the gentlemen on that side of the aisle about what has happened in the other body. The other body a very tough budget resolution, and yet in the last week, even though their budget resolution eliminated money for EDA, they put \$30 million in the supplemental appropriation for EDA. Even though the body's Budget Resolution eliminated the money for the ARC, the Appalachian Regional Commission, that body put \$82 million in the appropriation bill, for the ARC.

Even though the other body opposed funding the TVA in their budget resolution, they put \$90 million in their appropriation for that.

If this resolution passes, we cannot do the same thing that is going on in the other body here in the House. We will be proving once and for all that we indeed serious, and we will be making real progress.

I would ask the gentleman from that side of the aisle on the Budget Committee and the others to join us. They should be joining us. They should be saying that this shows the House is serious about the deficit. They should not say white simply because we say black.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of

the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will go ahead and pass this rule and get along with our business.

May I say that the Budget Act was not required because of appropriations from our Committee on Appropriations. The Budget Act was recommended by the study of Mr. Ullman of the Ways and Means Committee and myself representing the Appropriations Committee. We recommended the Budget Act because spending was bypassing the annual process by our Committee on Appropriations on 42 percent of Government spending.

What we have here is a resolution where we resolve to carry out what your Appropriations Committee is already doing. We pledged ourselves at the beginning of our action this year, in the absence of a budget resolution, that we would follow the House budget as passed by the House. We have done that and we will continue to do that. The resolution calls on us to do that. Here we would resolve to limit ourselves to the House budget provisions.

May I point out that the budget resolution was due May 15, 70 days ago. If you exclude Mondays and Fridays, we have remaining 13 legislative days. If there is much more delay, justified or otherwise, you are inviting a continuing resolution. We do not ever want that, we have not wanted to legislate by continuing resolution in the past, however it became necessary. This could easily happen again.

I urge you to let us go ahead now. If the Rules Committee wants me up there in the afternoon, in the morning and at midnight, I will be there, because I want the Congress to finish its business. Of course, I would prefer that all waivers be made at once for our convenience. I will point out that we will have about 9,000 witnesses before us this term, and we have had action of various types on appropriation bills in one single day last week. We are ready to work day and night to finish the business of the Congress.

A number of our colleagues wanted us to release the allocations made among the various subcommittees. We have done that. You have it before you and you can look at it. Of course, we reserve the right to reallocate, if such a course should become necessary. I recall a few years ago where we had to take \$1 billion to take care of damages caused at Mount St. Helens. We may have to do that again on any number of emergencies. But when we have to act, our action will be subject to your approval.

I wish to say again that we have 13 legislative days to wind up this fiscal year and to take care of the future of this Government. Your Committee on

Appropriations has not needed a budget resolution for us to stay in line. We have held the line each year, and will do so this year.

The public has been led to believe that we must have a budget, and if we cannot get one between the two Houses, surely it is appropriate for us to adopt a course as though we had a budget resolution. Our committee will follow the course, for which this resolution provides.

With 13 days remaining, I hope we will adopt this resolution, provide the necessary rules, and proceed.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. Let me say I can understand why the chairman of the Budget Committee wants to pass this resolution.

But let me rise in opposition for perhaps a different reason. I think it is just very poorly timed. I was disturbed, as I think some Members on the Democratic side of the aisle were, that there are reports from the other body that there are those who do not think that we need a budget.

I certainly think that this is faulty reasoning. We do need a budget and we ought not to give up. We have made, I think, some good-faith offers on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol to try to reach a budget compromise.

Let me say to my colleagues in both Chambers, let us not let the process die. There are those who want to give up. And as I said earlier, I can understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman GRAY, wants to pass this resolution in the name of increasing pressure for a budget compromise. But it actually waives the budget in a blanket way, and that would be a mistake in my opinion.

This resolution would suspend the usual 302(b) allocations to the Appropriations Committee, which is one of the most important enforcement mechanisms for deficit reduction. The resolution would be an admission of failure that we cannot achieve a real deficit-reduction package. It suspends the budget process, which is already under attack as toothless.

□ 1120

I give Chairman GRAY credit for making a very good-faith effort to go to the Senate in the conference, on which I serve. I also commend the gentleman from South Carolina. They have offered a compromise. It does not go as far as our side of the aisle wants to go or Members of the Senate. But Chairman GRAY has offered a \$273 billion spending cut package over 3 years and \$56 billion or so in the first year. We ought to give him credit for making an offer which goes further than the House's original budget by

making additional real spending cuts, strengthening reconciliation, and increasing defense budget authority.

Now I would say to some of my colleagues we are going back and attempting to pass today the original House budget which has \$22 billion less saving than the House's second offer. I think that is a mistake. It is poorly timed. Both the House and Senate conferees are trying to achieve a new and better compromise budget package. I definitely want to say, as I previously did, that the chairman has made a good-faith effort. Let the Senate come back and make a new offer. We can then resolve our differences in the next 48 hours, which I am optimistic we can do, if we set aside some of our pseudodifferences and get down to numbers.

Chairman DOMENICI has set a budget savings benchmark that is very positive with regard to reducing the deficit. It is a bold package. Perhaps our Democratic friends cannot go that far. There are some of us in the House in the Republican Party that cannot go that far on certain items.

But I think we can find a way to work together to increase domestic savings without hurting the defense of the country and improving, as I think the chairman would like to do, the process for reconciliation or budget enforcement, as he and the gentleman from South Carolina have offered.

A good place to start in looking for additional savings might be to abolish or dramatically reduce synthetic fuels subsidies to major oil companies for producing synthetic fuels. We might think in terms of reducing subsidies for the Eximbank which subsidizes corporations for trading or exporting to other countries. We might reduce substantially outdated so-called economic development agencies. Those reforms would save \$5 billion over 3 years. We might want to consider giving Amtrak's Northeast corridor routes to its employees for long-term savings and pass a moratorium on the strategic petroleum reserve [SPR] for additional savings of a couple of billion dollars.

We could abolish the Direct Loan Program of the SBA as recommended by the National Federation of Independent Businessmen, for another billion.

There are \$3 billion to \$5 billion that could easily be saved in other business subsidy programs beyond those I mentioned. I am not outlining a plan; I am not outlining the things that absolutely must be done. But we ought to go back in conference and not let the process die. In my opinion, we are about \$5 to \$7 billion apart in fiscal year 1986 and about \$20 billion apart over the 3 years.

Now, do not forget, my friends, we are talking about almost a \$1 trillion budget in a \$4 trillion-plus GNP and

we have narrowed our differences to around \$7 billion to \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge economy. We have narrowed our differences. The chairman and the gentleman from South Carolina have made a good-faith effort to resolve some of the differences on reconciliation and enforcement. More could be done, more cuts could be made, some of which I have outlined.

I really think that the differences between the House and the Senate budget are not irreconcilable. They can be broached. The outlines for agreement are in sight. We ought to get moving.

On that basis, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the Capitol to reconsider their support for the budget process. Let us get the conferees back and make the effort that has to be made, not on behalf of either side of the Capitol Hill or either party but on behalf of the American economy, getting those deficits down and getting a good budget for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY].

Mr. MACKAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I speak for a group on this side of the aisle which last week objected to waiving the Budget Act, for two very specific reasons. One, we felt that the waiver would force us to give up the right to insist on reconciliation, a discipline required by the Budget Act. Two, we were unwilling to waive our right under the Budget Act to insist on 302(b) allocations. Without these allocations, which set upper limits on spending for each program, there is no way for individual Members to understand the entire spending proposal being put forward by the Appropriations Committee.

Today's resolution assures us that both of these rights will be protected.

Now clearly there is going to be a continuing resolution. This is going to happen whether we waive the Budget Act or whether we do not waive the Budget Act, and that is going to be because we have stalled around and played games far beyond the time contemplated to go forward with the budget resolution.

I do not know whose fault that is. I think there is enough fault so that we can all take our share of the blame for the position we find ourselves in. But the question of what happens on the continuing resolution is an issue not to be decided today. That is the issue to be decided when we have a rule, this year I hope, that says we will have the same limitations on the continuing resolution that we have on general appropriations bills. If that rule had been in effect last year, we could have avoided the farce which took place at

the end of the session, when the continuing resolution negated all efforts to achieve fiscal discipline.

In the meantime, I believe we are preserving the discipline of the Budget Act, we are doing as much as we can do under the circumstances, not as people who get together under the oak tree on the lawn of the White House and decide the future of the world, but as general, ordinary Members of the House who say, "I want to force the system to work the way it is supposed to work." We are doing all we can do. I think there was a major concession made by the Appropriations Committee. We can go home to our constituents in August and say, "The budget process is not working right, but at least I can tell you now in advance what is going to happen so far as the House spending decisions are concerned." That is not a spectacular gain, but it is probably all we can achieve under the constraints of the White House agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. DERRICK. For purposes of debate only, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I held community meetings throughout my district. People asked me "Congresswoman, what happened to the budget?" I told them, "I believe politics was getting in the way of a joint House/Senate budget and that that is unfortunate."

Today by passing this resolution I think we can rise above politics and show America that we are breaking the logjam, that we are moving ahead with the \$56 billion deficit reduction this House already passed by such a wide margin.

Let the other body squabble, but let us move forward with deficit reduction. Let the other body walk out of conference, but let us move forward with deficit reduction. Let the other body work without a budget, but let us move forward with a budget.

Now I wish the other body would change, but we in the House cannot control that. But we can control what we do.

So let us move forward today with this resolution, with deficit reductions. Let us pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget when he said that we are not waiving the Budget Act here. That is

right. What we are doing is abandoning the Budget Act. What we have decided to do with this particular resolution is that we have decided that the process to which we have committed ourselves in the past does not work and so therefore we have learned to come up with a whole new process. This is another case of when you cannot live with the rules that you have set, you simply abandon the rules mainstream.

That is what we are doing here. When it comes to spending money, I think there is no barrier that this House will not abandon in order to spend the money. This bill is called a sunshine bill here. That is right. I would agree it is a sunshine bill. There is nothing under the Sun we will not do in order to spend money. This Congress has regularly overspent its own budget. Over the last 5 years, we have overspent our own budgets to the tune of \$150 billion or more. This is how we do it. This is exactly the kind of bill, the kind of approach that we use in order to overspend our own budgets.

□ 1130

Vote for this resolution if that is what you are going to do; that is fine, but your are voting for more spending and you are voting to abandon the budget process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we are conducting another one of those arcane debates some of us refer to as "inside baseball" around here. People out across the country expect two things of us in the context of our budget process.

One, they want us to cut spending; they want us to balance the budget; they want us to reduce spending; they want us to move at least in the direction of reduction in our annual deficit so that we get back to the historic level we began with in 1980 when President Reagan took office, and secondly, they want us to keep the process of government functioning; they do not want us to run up against that October 1 fiscal year deadline and have to close down the Federal Establishment for symbolic purposes.

I argue that this resolution today allows us to move forward on both of those issues. First of all, it does not in any way reduce the pressure on our budget conferees. As a conferee myself, I can tell you that we feel the pressure. It is the kind of pressure that results from out of the knowledge we have about the strength of "the bully pulpit," the Presidency, President Reagan's ability to stand up and cast aspersions against the Congress as his top aide, Mr. Regan did the other morning, for failing in our responsibilities to enact deficit reduction measures.

We know that however ineffective some of us may consider the budget process, it is the most important symbolic act we can engage in, and we will continue our efforts in the conference this week, next week and when we come back, if must be the case, in September to pass a resolution so that we can enact the proper framework to meet our needs.

We are also, I think, able to say that the Appropriations Committee historically has met its targets. Senator HATFIELD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a leading Republican, said in the debate on the Senate floor on the line-item veto yesterday that we have come \$12 to \$13 billion below President Reagan's spending requests since he has been in office; and right now the 10 appropriations bills that have come at least to full committee are \$7.5 billion below the budget authority granted to them in the 302(b) tentative allocation. This committee is not the problem.

This is the approach we need to impose discipline on ourselves; the Senate needs it as well; I hope we can proceed at least today to give confidence to our budget process and to the Appropriations Committee's proper approach as well.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in support of the resolution.

This is a resolution that gives us the tools to at least live within spending limits. It gives us the tools to control and reduce spending. Those who are attacking this resolution as an attack on the budget process really do not want to come to grips with the fact that we want something real to compare the appropriations measures to.

This resolution gives us 302(b) guidelines by which we can judge the appropriations as they come to the floor. It gives us the beginning of a reconciliation process where we can save billions of dollars in spending if we will move forward in that process.

It gives us a 302(a) limit which can limit any continuing resolution that will be coming before this House.

We can and should do more than just pass this resolution, but it is a beginning; it is a beginning that gets the House of Representatives on record in its rules that will live at least within the budget that we have already passed, and the other body, if it has more savings, can get to give or more savings to ask, can certainly amend what we pass in the appropriation and reconciliation process to implement those greater savings.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1

minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I have listened to some of the debate, and I am somewhat surprised by the statement from the other side. What this resolution says is that we will meet the other house halfway on a resolution, but in the meanwhile, the House, this House is going to put our own house in order.

It has been said that this resolution would diminish the pressure on the other house. I think it will increase the pressure. It will show that we here are able to act within a framework that brings about major savings.

So for all of those reasons, I hope very much that we will vote for the resolution. This is a very significant first step toward the kind of budget that this country needs.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a close call today. This is not an easy vote for a lot of people who care deeply about what we have done to this country in terms of the deficit. This is a close call today for those who are worried about jobs and get letters like I do about tomorrow and what it holds.

I did not support the budget that passed the House a couple weeks ago, and as a result it is very difficult for me to vote to put into effect the very budget that I voted against.

This is a close call, and I do not mean to cast stones in either direction, but I have decided that I cannot vote for this rule. I do so reluctantly; I do so without any animosity toward anyone. I just think the basic question is: Are we better off to put a bad budget in place or have no budget at all momentarily? Right now, I like the pressure of the individual votes on the appropriations bills. Because I voted against this budget, I am not going to be able to vote to impose it. That support is the responsibility of those who supported this budget originally. I did not. I can not.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and I rise in opposition to the resolution, for a number of reasons that have already been expressed.

Mr. Speaker, it would, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER] said, put into effect what many of us consider to be a very bad budget; a budget which as I recall in the area of nondefense domestic cuts actually contains \$13 billion above a freeze level.

I rise in opposition to the resolution because it is a vote for that very budget. What we are doing today would remove pressure on House budget conferees to get a budget; those of us who think it is important to have a budget should vote against this. There is no precedent for it; it erodes the budget process, and it would actually permit spending increase amendments to be offered to appropriations bills.

I hope that this vote today will be viewed as the big spending vote of this Congress, because I believe this vote is a budget-buster, and it is an abandonment of the budget process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for yielding, and I rise in somewhat reluctant support of the resolution.

The reason I do, Mr. Speaker, is because frankly the bottom line is, this is as good as we are going to do at this point. The fact of the matter is that we have made a good faith offer to the other body; \$56 billion in deficit reduction next year; \$273 billion over the next 3 years; and the Senate has in effect walked away from that offer.

At this point, we do not know whether the Senate is going to continue to participate in the conference or not. That leaves us in the position where we are totally at the mercy of the Senate.

I do not believe we can leave ourselves in that position, Mr. Speaker, and it seems we have no other choice. At least with this resolution we will be in a position to judge the appropriation bills against the earlier passed House budget resolution; and in addition to that, there is nothing in this resolution—and I say this to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and also to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle—there is nothing in this resolution that will prevent individual Members from having the opportunity to come to this mike in the well of this House and offer amendments to further trim the appropriation bill that might be coming forward.

I, for one, intend to do that, and I would urge my other colleagues who are really interested in deficit reduction, to join me in that effort.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

□ 1140

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the issue here today is whether there will be any semblance of discipline whatsoever in the House with regard to the budget resolution. That is the issue. I

regret as much as anyone else the fact that we do not have an agreement on a conference report regarding the budget resolution. There is plenty of blame for that to go around for everybody. But the blame will be on this House if we at the very least do not have the guts to support the very resolution that was adopted here. That is the point of this resolution. It is to provide some semblance of enforcement, scorekeeping on the appropriations bills. What could be the problem of providing a list of scorekeeping so we know whether in fact appropriation bills meet what is in the resolution? It provides for reconciliation. Reconciliation is the only tool we have in the budget process. This will allow reconciliation to go forward so that at the very least we can achieve those savings here.

Now, I understand the argument that some do not like the particular resolution. You may not like the shape of the barn; but it is no reason to leave the barn door open. This resolution tries to close that door. And at the very least, it is the minimal step that needs to be taken if we are to say to the American people, "We exercised some discipline on the budget process." This is your chance.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule. I think that to continue to make the statement about discipline and to make statements about one of the ways to avoid a continuing resolution is to vote for this rule is just totally misleading. The same comments were made last year. We ended up with a continuing resolution last year that increased spending by 13 percent.

What good is it to have scorekeeping if the scorekeeping is going to indicate to us that we are going to raise spending 13 percent?

So I think we are headed in the wrong direction. If we want discipline, we ought to make ourselves live within the Budget Act.

If I could, I would like to ask one question of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

What has happened to the \$4 billion in contracting out. Is the Appropriation Committee going to deal with contracting out?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The \$4 billion in contracting out has been assigned to the Appropriations Committee. It is in the 302 allocation and it is in the 302(b)'s.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me say that anybody who believes that the passage of this resolution is going to speed up the conference and the passage of a joint resolution on the budget must have to believe in the tooth fairy. They are living in dreamland. This makes it easier for the whole thing to go by the board.

I pointed out in my general remarks earlier something that seems to have escaped the people who want to do something about reducing expenditures. There is a difference in what they are doing here and what we would do otherwise. This is actually a matter of convenience. This is not only a blanket waiver of section 303(a) of the Budget Act, which requires a budget resolution to be in place before appropriation bills can be considered, but it actually would permit spending increase amendments to be offered to appropriation bills.

Under current procedure, even the House may waive section 303(a) against individual appropriation bills. Such waivers do not cover amendments which provide additional budget authority or spending increase amendments. Therefore, the adoption of this resolution can be interpreted as authorizing budget busting amendments that are currently prohibited under existing law.

So anybody who believes that we are going to reduce spending by passing a resolution that most of us on this side did not support in the first place, which had peanuts for reconciliation, which had a lot of puffery in it, escapes my imagination.

I think the only way to do anything about the deficit is to get back in conference and cut, cut, cut expenditures. Quit beating around the bush about it. Let us do something about it. And the way to do it is back in conference and not passing waivers like this. You can call it anything you like, but it is a waiver of the Budget Act and it opens the door for the Appropriations Committee to come in here on all of these appropriations with a blanket waiver of the Budget Act without coming up to the Rules Committee with a justification for a waiver on every bill.

I think they ought to come in and make their case on each individual appropriation bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, to have not voted for the budget resolution last time is no excuse for not voting for this resolution. That is an untenable excuse. The House passed the budget resolution. This is an opportunity for the House to say to the American people who are looking to this Congress for some sort of fiscal discipline that we, even though we have made every effort

that we possibly can to come to an agreement with the Senate on a budget resolution, that having failed that, until we do that—and I believe we will come to an agreement in very short order—that we are going to have what it takes to discipline ourselves.

There is no other way that the reconciliation process and the budget enforcement process of the House may go into effect without supporting this resolution.

So I suggest to the Members that those who are not voting for this because they do not like the budget are being very shortsighted. I voted for the budget. There is a lot in there I do not like. But what I do like and what I do demand, and what I do think we owe the American people is to tell them that, yes, the U.S. House of Representatives has what it takes to discipline itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, there really are only two questions to be answered in this vote, and that is: Do you want to enforce what you voted bipartisanly, overwhelmingly for, just a couple of months ago in stating what the House priorities were? Do you want to demonstrate to America and to the other body that you are prepared to discipline yourself, enforce over \$50 billion worth of savings? Or are we going to continue to play partisan politics and allow the red ink to swell up around us?

The Appropriations Committee, led by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, has already pledged itself to be a part of that great effort. That is the first question. So if you voted for the budget a couple of months ago, you ought to vote for this resolution.

Second, let me just say: Is this budget that we have from the House in conference the best budget in the world? I would say it is not. Given the constraints of the House policy, in terms of COLA's, given the constraints of the President's position on revenues, I believe it is a good start toward cutting spending. So let us enforce it; let us pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. 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 242, nays 184, not voting 7, as follows:

(Roll No. 251)

YEAS—242

Ackerman	Gaydos	Olin
Addabbo	Geddes	Orlitz
Akaka	Gephart	Owens
Alexander	Gibbons	Panetta
Anderson	Glickman	Pease
Andrews	Gonzalez	Penny
Annunzio	Gordon	Pepper
Anthony	Gray (IL)	Perkins
Aspin	Gray (PA)	Pickle
Atkins	Guarini	Price
AuCoin	Hall (OH)	Rahall
Barnard	Hall, Ralph	Rangel
Barnes	Hamilton	Ray
Bates	Hatcher	Reid
Bedell	Hawkins	Richardson
Bellenson	Hayes	Robinson
Bennett	Hefetz	Rodino
Berman	Hertel	Roe
Bevill	Howard	Rose
Biaggi	Hoyer	Rostenkowski
Boggs	Hubbard	Rowland (GA)
Boland	Huckaby	Royal
Boner (TN)	Hughes	Russo
Bonior (MI)	Hutto	Sabo
Bonker	Jacobs	Savage
Borski	Jenkins	Scheuer
Bosco	Jones (NC)	Schroeder
Boucher	Jones (OK)	Schumer
Boxer	Jones (TN)	Seiberling
Brooks	Kanjorski	Sharp
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Shelby
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Sikorski
Bryant	Kennelly	Sisisky
Burton (CA)	Kildee	Skelton
Bustamante	Kleczka	Slattery
Byron	Kolter	Smith (FL)
Carper	Kostmayer	Smith (IA)
Carr	LaFaive	Solzar
Chappell	Lantos	Spratt
Clay	Leath (TX)	St. Germain
Coelho	Lehman (CA)	Staggers
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (FL)	Stallings
Collins	Leland	Stark
Cooper	Levin (MI)	Stenholm
Coyne	Levine (CA)	Stokes
Crockett	Lipinski	Stratton
Daniel	Lloyd	Studds
Darden	Long	Swift
Daschle	Lowry (WA)	Synar
de la Garza	Luken	Tallan
DeLumis	Lundine	Tauzin
Derrick	MacKay	Taylor
Dicks	Manton	Thomas (GA)
Dingell	Markley	Torres
Dixon	Martinez	Torricelli
Donnelly	Matsui	Towns
Dorgan (ND)	Mavroules	Traficant
Dowdy	McCloskey	Traxler
Durbin	McCurdy	Udall
Dwyer	McHugh	Valentine
Dymally	Mica	Vento
Dyson	Mikulski	Visclosky
Eckart (OH)	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Edgar	Mineta	Walgren
Edwards (CA)	Mitchell	Watkins
English	Moakley	Waxman
Erdreich	Mollohan	Weaver
Evans (IL)	Montgomery	Weiss
Fascell	Moody	Wheat
Fazio	Morrison (CT)	Whitley
Feighan	Mrazek	Whitten
Flippo	Murphy	Williams
Florio	Murtha	Wilson
Foglietta	Natcher	Wirth
Foley	Neal	Wise
Ford (TN)	Nelson	Wolpe
Fowler	Nichols	Wyden
Frank	Nowak	Yates
Frost	Oskar	Yatron
Fuqua	Oberstar	Young (MO)
Garcia	Obey	

NAYS—184

Applegate	Gradison	Oxley
Archer	Green	Packard
Armey	Gregg	Parris
Badham	Grotberg	Pashayian
Bartlett	Gunderson	Petri
Barton	Hammerschmidt	Porter
Bateman	Hansen	Pursell
Bentley	Hartnett	Quillen
Bereuter	Hendon	Regula
Bilirakis	Henry	Ridge
Billey	Hiller	Rinaldo
Boehlert	Hillis	Ritter
Boulter	Holt	Roberts
Breaux	Hopkins	Roemer
Broomfield	Horton	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Hunter	Roth
Broyhill	Hyde	Roukema
Burton (IN)	Ireland	Rowland (CT)
Callahan	Jeffords	Rudd
Campbell	Johnson	Saxton
Carney	Kasich	Schaefer
Chandler	Kemp	Schneider
Chappie	Kindness	Schuette
Cheney	Kolbe	Schulze
Clinger	Kramer	Sensenbrenner
Coats	Lagomarsino	Shaw
Cobey	Latta	Shumway
Coble	Leach (IA)	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Siljander
Combest	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Conte	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lightfoot	Smith (NE)
Coughlin	Livingston	Smith (NH)
Courter	Loeffler	Smith (NJ)
Craig	Lott	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Snowe
Daub	Mack	Snyder
Davis	Madigan	Solomon
DeLay	Marlenee	Spence
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Stangeland
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Strang
DiGuardi	Mazzoli	Stump
Dornan (CA)	McCain	Sundquist
Dreier	McCandless	Sweeney
Duncan	McCollum	Swindall
Early	McDade	Tauke
Eckert (NY)	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Vander Jagt
Emerson	McKernan	Vucanovich
Evans (IA)	McKinney	Walker
Fawell	McMillan	Weber
Fledler	Meyers	Whitehurst
Fields	Miller (OH)	Whittaker
Fish	Miller (WA)	Wolf
Franklin	Molinari	Wortley
Frenzel	Moore	Wylie
Gallo	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Gekas	Morrison (WA)	Young (FL)
Gilman	Myers	Zschau
Gingrich	Nelson	
Goodling	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—7

Downey	Lujan	Wright
Ford (MI)	Michel	
Hefner	Monson	

□ 1200

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Ford of Michigan for, with Mr. Monson against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1210

THE BATTLE HYMN OF THE REPUBLICANS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I am not permitted to sing on the House floor. But, on this historic occasion, I would like to recite "The Battle Hymn of the Republicans":

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the victorious G.O.P.
We trampled down those Democrats by a score of 9 to 3.
At 17-6-1, you call this a rivalry?
The G.O.P. is marching on.
We practiced every day, Pursell and Coats worked up a sweat;
While the Democrats spent their weeks adding to the national debt.
They tried to legislate themselves some talent, I am willing to bet;
The G.O.P. is marching on.
We can hear the Donkeys whimper, with Chappie leading the whine;
But he shouldn't feel so bad; with that talent they played fine.
After batting against Schaefer, they just got splinters on the pine;
The G.O.P. is marching on.
As their coach, I helped them to accomplish this great feat;
I said, "Hit it to Russo or Bonior; that will ensure their defeat."
So stop crying, old Chappie; get out of the kitchen if you can't stand the heat.
The G.O.P. is marching on.
Now the game is over, one more year 'till 86;
And who will win next year, I know who I would pick.
Don't feel bad, old Chappie; you did well for a Florida hick.
The G.O.P. is marching on.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1986

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REDESIGN AND RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EAST PLAZA OF THE CAPITOL FOR INCREASED SECURITY

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

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, to redesign and reconstruct the east plaza of the U.S. Capitol to

provide for increased security and for esthetic purposes. I am pleased to be joined in introducing the bill by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Hon. E. CLAY SHAW, as well as several other distinguished Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan effort is part of the crucial response to security needs of which we have become all too aware in recent years.

As my colleagues are aware, in November 1983, a bombing was carried out in the Senate wing of the Capitol by an extremist organization. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds subsequently held hearings on increased security for the Capitol, and several additional security measures were implemented. This legislation is another important step toward updating security, while at the same time providing a ceremonial entrance to the Capitol substantially in accord with the Olmsted plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the landscape plan of the 1981 master plan for the U.S. Capitol. It will provide for use of the east plaza as a major pedestrian and ceremonial entrance point appropriate for the main entrance to the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will recognize the importance of this legislation so that we can move quickly to detailed plans which will protect employees and visitors to the Capitol while ensuring that the east front reflects the pride which all Americans feel for the Capitol as a symbol of democracy. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and support timely passage.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE SECURITY OF EAST FRONT PLAZA OF THE CAPITOL

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce along with the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds and sponsor of the bill, Mr. Young of Missouri, and a number of my colleagues, legislation intended to substantially improve the security of the east front plaza of the Capitol.

All of us are keenly aware of the increasing acts of terrorism being carried out worldwide and realize we are as vulnerable here in Washington as the passengers who boarded their flight in Athens or the American soldiers who were senselessly murdered in a cafe in El Salvador.

I know many of you can recall the bomb blast which ripped through the