□ 1205

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 342, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2015, BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 105–218) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, concerning the time just yielded to the minority, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the standard rule for consideration of a conference report on reconciliation legislation. All points of order are waived against the bill and its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Finally, the rule provides 90 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that we have extended the debate time from the customary 1 hour to 90 minutes in order to maximize the time for the House to debate this very historic agreement. And when I state ''very historic agreement,'' Mr. Speaker, I want to heap praise on the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who has brought to this floor something that many of us have worked so hard for over all these years. And it could not have happened without the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], certainly his committee, and the staff of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1969, Neal Armstrong and the crew of Apollo 11 made their famous leap for mankind onto the surface of the Moon. Later that same year, the Federal Government recorded its first balanced budget in a decade, an actual budget surplus of $300 million. Both are milestones, Mr. Speaker, because the budget has not been balanced since that time back in 1969.

In fact, in 1997, the Government spent over $6,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. And that is up from $500 in 1960. Each person's share of that national debt is more than $14,500, and that is up from $1,300 in 1960. This goes to show us what has happened over the years.

And even worse, the Federal Government is three times larger than in 1960, and the tax burden is unconscionable on the American people, particularly middle-class American people, who make up the real backbone of this Nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, this Republican Congress and President Clinton will stem the tide of this rising sea of red ink, and it will stop the growth of Government. Today, the Republican Congress will deliver America's working families the first balanced budget in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues recall, in 1994, when the American people gave Republicans control of the people's House, we pledged to balance the budget. Today, we deliver on that promise.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, this body has debated balanced budgets many times over the last few years, but today's debate is special. It represents a historic achievement for the future benefit of America's children, for their families and for the economy of this Nation. For today we do not just debate a balanced budget, we actually deliver one for the American people, what they have been asking of this body for so many years now.

This endeavor proves that Congress, working with the administration, can achieve common goals without compromising fundamental principles, showing the American people that we can work together to solve problems, and the American people are applauding this every day now since we came to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud to inform the American people that our democratic process, something that has been maligned in recent years, is working. This democratic process, even with the Congress and with a President of opposing parties has produced a bipartisan balanced budget agreement that cuts taxes for the first time in 16 years, that preserves Medicare and protects it from bankruptcy into the 21st century, that slows the growth of total Federal spending to 3 percent a year. That is no easy task. And that shifts power, money and influence away from Washington and to the people in the States and communities.

Mr. Speaker, while this is a bipartisan agreement, it is useful to recognize just how far we have come. Just 4 years ago, this Congress under a Democrat majority passed the largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America. Today we cut the tax burden on American families for every single working American in this country.

Just 4 years ago, Mr. Speaker, this Congress expanded new entitlement programs and they increased spending by tens of billions of dollars. What is different today? Today we slow the growth of entitlement spending. Today we increase budget enforcement, and today we actually reduce Federal spending to 18.9 percent of the Gross Domestic Product by the year 2002. That will be the first time since 1974, 25 years ago, that spending has fallen below 20 percent of the GDP.

Mr. Speaker, just 4 years ago this Congress passed increased Government spending packages. Today we make the Federal Government smaller, allowing the free market to provide the stimulus for the economy to create long-term job growth. Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican Congress has made to the economy.

Since the 1994 election, the Dow Jones Industrial Average has more than doubled from 3,900 points to 8,100 points, interest rates have dropped from 8 percent to 6 percent, and 6.4 million new jobs have been created. The economy is growing because taxes, spending, and the Government are not growing.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not here today to only look at the past or even the present but to the future of this great country. The balanced budget we debate here today is built on a solid foundation of programmatic and economic assumptions, a foundation that will generate benefits to American working families for years to come. This is a package that will keep on delivering financial relief to families and to businesses in the form of lower taxes, lower interest rates, higher job growth and a stronger economy, and we are locking it all into law so that it has to happen.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in my district in upstate New York, a balanced budget will significantly enhance the opportunities of working families to care for their children and to help their communities. Alan Greenspan, greatly respected by both sides of the aisle,

Democrats and Republicans alike, and by the American people, he is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and he has testified that a balanced budget will lead to lower interest rates, as much as 2 percent lower on home mortgages, on family farms, on auto loans, on student loans. For the average homeowner in my district, before even calculating in the benefits of the cuts in the capital gains tax, a 2 percent lower interest rate on a home mortgage as a result of a balanced budget would save that family over $130 a month. That is $130 more a month to send a kid to college, to buy groceries or to pay for child care, which is so badly needed today in the pockets of the American people. It means more investment in the local community, a stronger local economy, and higher wages.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, these hardworking families will do more in 1 year to help the less fortunate, the young and the old, than this Congress could do under a banner of compassion in an entire decade. All these benefits result merely from Congress fulfilling its moral obligation to balance this budget year in and year out.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one final observation. During this debate today, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will assert that Republicans are only interested in helping the so-called wealthy in America. Mr. Speaker, let me state for the record right now that I plead guilty to that charge. I believe that a growing economy helps all of America's families, for it was not a Republican President but it was President John F. Kennedy that said ''a rising tide lifts all boats.''

Furthermore, and this is so terribly important, a recent NASDAQ report summarized in a recent Los Angeles Times story found the following facts. These are facts, these are not Republican rhetoric, these are facts out of NASDAQ:

Fifty-five percent of the stocks in America today are held by household families. Fifty-five percent. That means middle class America holds 55 percent of the stock today.

Forty-seven percent of all investors are women. Fifty-five percent of all investors are under the age of 50. And 10 percent of all investors, and this is so terribly important, have started to invest within the last 10 years.

These numbers do not even include all of those who have their pensions invested in the stock market or in mutual funds, which is the case for many older Americans. These so-called wealthy people are middle class working families that know that a balanced budget, lower taxes, and a smaller Government mean higher wages, more jobs, and a stronger economy.

That is really what we are all here on this floor to try to do. That is why I urge all Members to join these American families in supporting the balanced budget we have here before us today. It is good for families, it is good for America. The future will be better because of what we do here today.

And, Mr. Speaker, what we do here today is what the Republican Party stands for, and that is cutting taxes for all working Americans, every single one of them, cutting runaway entitlement spending, saving Medicare from bankruptcy. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are here today balancing the budget and shrinking the size and the power of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been so proud to be a Republican Member of Congress for what we are doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend from Massachusetts, I was concerned by his earlier concerns. I went back and checked. The gentleman was correct. When we initially announced that the entire bill was available at http://speakernews.house.gov in fact it was not all fully uploaded. I waited to make sure the entire bill was totally loaded. It is now available not just to any Member of the House, not just to all the congressional staffs who I hope are watching this debate, all of whom can access it simultaneously without having to xerox it, but in addition it is available to every citizen in this country and anyone worldwide on the Internet.

As the gentleman knows, we are still having growing pains learning how to be in the information age, but we have now made this available to every citizen in the country. We are going to test this afternoon when we file the tax bill and see how long it takes to totally upload the tax bill for the same process. Sometime late this afternoon, every citizen in the country, without a lobbyist, without a trade association, without any payment, will have access to the tax bill in full. I do thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention. We are still learning, but I did want to make that available.

By the way, if I might, this is the last page. We printed it out, because my good friend had pointed out earlier that he could not get them all printed out.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Speaker will autograph it for me.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that from the Speaker and I am glad that all the citizens of America have this now. If the Republican Party would just allow them a few hours to read it, I think the public service would really be done.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of my committee, my dear friend, for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to begin by registering my frustration at being expected to vote on this very enormous bill that was dropped outside my door at 3:30 this morning. It came the same time as the milkman. But I am not exactly sure if my Republican colleagues drafted the bill we expected them to draft, and I suspect that no one else is sure either. This bill has come to the floor with an unprecedented bipartisan compromise in cooperation. It is a shame that it ended today with the martial law rule. Members should have the chance to carefully consider this bill before voting on it.

Mr. Speaker, although this bill will balance our budget in the short term, I do not believe it gets us where we need to be in the long term. I know that quite a few of my colleagues will support this bill, and there are very good reasons to do so, but I at this present time cannot. It squeezes funding for education, training, health programs, and school construction, and I do not believe that it should.

One particular problem for me, Mr. Speaker, is the hit that the hospitals will have to take. We in Massachusetts are very fortunate to have some of the world's greatest hospitals and research facilities. They already bear an enormous share of the financial burden of our health care problems, but this bill will cut Medicare spending by $115 billion by reducing payments to these very same hospitals and the doctors that serve in them. It also cuts Medicaid spending by $13 billion by reducing payments to these same hospitals that serve large numbers of poor people, like our Boston City Hospital. Mr. Speaker, the hospitals in my district are already facing enormous budget crunches. They cannot stand it anymore.

This bill also cuts $4.8 billion from Federal employees' retirement programs over the next 5 years. Federal employees work just as hard as those in the private sector, but because they work in public service rather than the private sector, they are going to be penalized.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also makes changes that will cut $1.8 billion in student loans and $1.8 billion from housing programs. It reduces section 8 adjustments and replaces the FHA foreclosure relief program. Another provision in this bill which many of my colleagues may not be aware of is an increase in the public debt limit to $5.95 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Democrats in Congress and the Clinton administration, this bill is a lot better than it was. It expands health care for children, although not enough. It restores Supplemental Security Income and Medicare benefits to legal immigrants. It also contains funding for States to help welfare recipients find jobs. Again, Mr. Speaker, not enough.

There are good reasons to support this bill, and I understand why many of my colleagues will do so. But as I said,

because of those other matters, I just cannot at this time. For the sake of our hospitals, for the sake of our students, for the sake of our housing programs, I cannot support the bill.

I cannot support a bill that will hurt Massachusetts hospitals as much as this one will. I cannot support a bill that, although it provides much needed money to help poor children get health insurance, it provides the money in the form of block grants which may or may not be used for that purpose.

There are some very good provisions in this bill that I very much support, and I congratulate my colleagues for their hard work on this bill. I am relieved to see many of the education issues and the food stamp problem have been taken care of.

□ 1230

And although I strongly suspect that this bill will pass and that our President will sign it, I simply, as I said, cannot support it. So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to increase debate time to 3 hours.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this conference report, and I am satisfied, and even proud, of the outcome, but I cannot vote for the rule in this case, and I want to explain why.

I think it is being brought to the floor, this conference agreement, with unseemly haste for something so serious and so far-reaching.

I was here until midnight last night. The Democratic staff of the Committee on the Budget were here until after 2:30. Most of that time of our staff on the Committee on the Budget was spent trying to prepare reports so that we could tell Members on our side from our inside perspective as the Committee on the Budget just what is in this conference agreement and what is not, what compromises have been cut, what deals have been done that they need to know about before they make their decision to vote, and it was a frustrating, sometimes fruitless, effort to call different places on the Hill and try to find out what was in the conference report because we did not have a copy of the conference report.

The staff left at 2:30, the conference report was filed at 3:20 this morning, it was not until we got back to work this morning, just an hour before the House convened that we found the conference report on our doorstep. We finished posthaste the reports so that we could deliver it to Members on our side. They got it at 10 o'clock this morning, just before the House convened to take up this matter.

Now there are strong reasons for having a certain delay. The rules of the House, the rules of the House longstanding, call for a 3-day layover for conference reports, 24-hour layover for rules which have been waived, but 3 days for a conference report, and there are good reasons for that. Conference reports are the last station on the track. We are making law. There are no more opportunities on our part to correct mistakes, to add something, change something, to perfect a piece of legislation.

Furthermore, in the House we have what in the State legislature they call free conference powers virtually. As everybody knows, conference reports are hammered out behind closed doors. The conferees make deals, cut compromises, go out of scope all the time, and the rule waives any points of order for going out of scope. And my colleagues will find plenty of things in this conference report, I am sure, which are out of scope, one in the House bill and one in the Senate bill, that have been concocted by the conferees.

That is why the longstanding rules of this House have provided 3 days for Members to see what is in it, sauce and blow it, weigh it and come to a deliberate decision as to whether or not they would support it.

And then when the matter finally comes to the floor, there ought to be ample time to discuss something so far-reaching as this because this is not just an ordinary conference agreement, this is probably the single most important piece of legislation that this Congress will adopt in the 105th Congress. Yet we are going to take it up in an hour and a half. The Senate provides for 10 hours of debate, 10 hours on the tax reconciliation bill, 10 hours on the spending reconciliation bill. We have an hour and a half, and I have Members over here pulling at my coattails because they want to say something.

Mr. Speaker, they want to explain why they are voting for it or why they are voting against it; they want to say they are in favor of this. That is the way the House operates. They want to have a real debate, and we will not be able to have it with the truncated time that has been allowed for this particular bill.

This is too fast a track for legislation so serious. It should not be railroaded against this House. We should vote against the previous question.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the chairman of the Committee on Rules quote my uncle, President Kennedy, saying that a rising tide lifts all boats. I would say that in this tax bill what we have is a tax cut that will raise the yachts in places like the Ocean Reef Club and other Republican strongholds of this country, but the people that own the little bass boats of America, the only rise they are going to get is when they go up on the rocks as a result of the cuts that are going to be created in order to pay for the wonderful tax cuts that are contained in this bill.

Look, the Republicans shut down the Congress of the United States last year because of our protests about the level of budget cuts contained in terms of the Medicare budget. This bill, make no mistake, my colleagues, this bill contains the exact same level of Medicare cuts as last year's bill did. That is the hidden truth that we are not seeing everybody who is walking around, giving each other high fives and whooping and hooping down at the White House or on the floor or off in the Halls of the Congress saying what a wonderful thing this is. Everybody is all talking about how we are going to balance the budget of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we are balancing the budget in the most unbalanced fashion one can possibly imagine, lining the pockets of the wealthiest Americans, pretending to working people that they are going to get a tax cut. They get a tax cut. Seventy-five percent of these tax benefits go to the top 20 percent of the American people. It is a sham.

In order to pay for it what are we going to do? We have cut the housing budget by 25 percent, we are cutting the homeless budget by 25 percent, we come back, we are going to get rid of the fuel assistance program. They say they are going to do so much to help out education, but we come back, they are going to cut almost 20 percent of the entire research and development accounts of the Government. They say before the American people this year we are going to put 6 percent more into the National Institutes of Health budget in order to look after women's health and breast cancer research, but then we are going to come back somehow, according to these numbers, we are going to come back and cut 20 percent out of that same budget over the course of the next 5 years.

This budget is a sham, and we ought to have the truth about the budget come out before we are forced to vote on it.

This rule that we are going to be forced to vote on gives us 15 minutes, 15 minutes to discuss what is in fact in this bill, and I say, ''Take your 15 minutes and stuff it, stuff it the same place you ought to stuff this tax bill, stuff it the same place you ought to stuff these spending cuts. It's not right to force spending cuts on the working families in order to provide a tax cut to the rich.''

Get rid of this tax bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised by the gentleman from Massachusetts in his delivery.

As my colleagues know, I was very proud to have been a John F. Kennedy Democrat, I was very proud of it, and I was for many years until the Democratic Party drifted away from the

principles of John F. Kennedy and JERRY SOLOMON, in my eyes, and that is why Ronald Reagan and I switched parties and became Republicans, because we really believe that the people back home know better than the people here in Washington.

Let me just take one more second to say I cannot believe the gentleman would tell these people to stuff it. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] a very, very distinguished Member from the gentleman's side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], a liberal Member from the gentleman's side, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]; this reads like Who's Who in the Democratic Party, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL]; Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE RANGEL signing this conference report and voting for this conference report. I do not think they are going to stuff it, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and on the other side of the aisle Senators LAUTENBERG, SARBANES, Senator MOYNIHAN from my State, very, very respected Democrat, and Senator ROCKEFELLER are going to vote for this conference report that the gentleman says, ''Stuff it.''

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding briefly.

I would just point out that the gentleman probably had a long list of Democrats that voted for the 1981 budget cuts that in 1982 wished they had not, and probably a lot of Republicans felt the same way.

The truth of the matter is that for the gentleman from New York to use President Kennedy on this House floor indicating that he would support the kind of cuts in terms of the programs that are necessary to fund a tax cut that is largely going to the wealthy is, I think, reshaping the history of what President Kennedy stood for when he cut taxes in 1960.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I not only think John F. Kennedy would be voting, and supporting and bringing this bill to the floor, I think TED KENNEDY, whose picture is here with the President yesterday in the New York Times applauding this legislation, would also be voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and someone who has led the fight for balanced budget and fiscal responsibility in this House for many years.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the time and I share his enthusiasm. I rise in strong support of this appropriate rule, and I believe his observation about the tide is correct.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 30 years since Congress has balanced the Nation's books, a generation and a half that is, of spending money we do not have, running up the tab on our children and our grandchildren, avoiding tough decisions, and Americans are tired of that. So today and tomorrow and the day after we are going to be putting in place the final details of the first real achievable balanced budget in 30 years. The magnitude of the change in the direction this legislative accomplishment represents is very, very great indeed. Consider that just 4 years ago the White House and Democratic majority here pushed through the largest tax increase, the largest tax increase in American history, just 4 years ago. What a difference 4 years and a new majority can make.

I know some will be skeptical that may be just another promise that we cannot keep here, and I do not blame people who wish to withhold their full exuberance about this until the ink is dry and the effects of this historic agreement are felt across the land. But the bills we vote on in the coming hours and days hold more than a promise to balance the budget and bring about tax relief for American families. These bills are the implementation of the promises, and there is accountability built in for all of us. We cannot run, we cannot hide, we will be here, and we will be judged.

As chairman of a legislative and budget process subcommittee, I want to take a second to point out to Members that this bill includes a series of clean up provisions in our budget enforcement rules, including extending the pay as you go and spending limit procedures. Of course we know additional work is needed to beef up budget enforcement, and budget process reform will take place in this Congress as has been promised.

Mr. Speaker, for too long Americans have had to get by with less while the folks in Washington rolled merrily along taxing and spending to support the ever growing Federal Government. Look around, my colleagues will see it. This agreement means tax relief for individuals, for families with children, for students, for small businesses, for homeowners, for those with family farms. It brings a measure of fairness to the system, and it is predicated on the fundamental belief that Government taxes too much, not too little. We are getting control over spending under the discretionary side, and we are shrinking the size and scope of the reach of Government and, man, is that good news for America.

This legislation takes the first steps toward solving the long term problems with Medicare, laying the groundwork for us to come together on a comprehensive plan to rescue the problem for coming generations. We are expanding choice and benefits for seniors, clamping down on waste, fraud and abuse, a problem whose vast proportions have made news in recent days; in fact are in the headlines today. And we are modernizing the program's payment and care delivery systems. This is a long overdue down payment on Medicare, and America's current and future seniors come out the winners.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many details in this plan, and I am sure it is still not perfect. I fully expect that the coming days will bring efforts by those who prefer the status quo of big government, to pick it apart provision by provision, and indeed we have already started to hear some of the clamor on the floor today. But we have done the unthinkable by Washington standards. We have kept our promise to the American taxpayers, and that is what this is about. We pledge to balance the budget. We are doing it. We pledge to save Medicare. We are doing it. And we pledge to cut taxes, and we are doing it.

I cannot think of a single reason to delay this process. It is all long overdue, it is wanted by the people we represent and work for in this country. The time is now. Any deviation to go to motions to commit or other dilatory tactics are just delaying the inevitable. We are going to give this country the relief this country deserves and wants, and we are going to do it this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule and for the wonderful agreement that has been worked out.

□ 1245

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman in exile for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we promised and we delivered. In August 1981, President Reagan, when he signed the tax bill of 1981, said that we will balance the budget as a result of this bill by October 1, 1983. That was the promise. What was delivered? Four and one-half trillion dollars of new debt.

Two courageous Presidents looked that debt in the eye and acted. One was a Republican, George Bush. In 1990, he said the deficit is a problem, and we must act. He was savaged, savaged by his own party and by the Speaker of this House.

In 1993, a courageous President with vision said we must confront this deficit, for this generation and for generations yet to come. Almost to a person, Republicans rose and said the economy is going to go into the dumpster, unemployment will rise, inflation will rise, and deficits will rise.

Mr. Speaker, exactly the opposite happened. Not one Republican had the courage or the vision to vote for the 1993 bill. But for that bill, we would not be here this day.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support both of these bills. They are not what I would have written, and perhaps what no Member individually would have written, but we have collectively come together and we are going to act. In my opinion, it will be good for people and it will be good for the economy, which is good for our country and for our people.

But let there be no mistake about what the history of this fight has been. Bill Clinton said we needed to confront this deficit, but we needed to do so while investing in our people, in making sure that average working families were advantaged by this particular piece of legislation.

We came to grips with that issue, realizing full well that there would be a political cost, and indeed there was in 1994. There was a cost, because across this land our candidates were attacked as taxers and spenders. But in fact, what they did was bring the deficit down for 5 years in a row, and people say the last time it was done was 1969. That was, of course, following 8 years of Democratic Presidencies through January of 1969, Mr. Speaker; Democratic leadership, we had a balanced budget. And again, we are going to have a balanced budget because of Democratic leadership that has brought the deficit down 5 years in a row, the first time that has happened since before the Civil War.

I stand to say that I am proud of the fact that I voted for that 1993 bill. We would not be here today but for that. I am proud of the fact that my President, your President, has led us to a point where we can balance the budget while investing in America's future and our people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because of the time constraints on debate, but I support the underlying budget spending bill. The reason is because today Congress is taking a major step in cutting the number of uninsured children.

Over a year ago Democrats had made this a top priority, while Republicans were balking at finding a solution. Earlier this year, while Democrats were leading the charge to reduce the ranks of the 10 million uninsured children, Republicans were questioning the need to help working families provide for their uninsured children.

It was not until the President's inclusion, after Democrats' urging, of funding for children's health care in his initial budget that Republicans realized that resistance would be hopeless. Even then, though, they had to be dragged to the table. House Republicans pushed a children's health care block grant program that did not guarantee one penny to actually insure kids. The Congressional Budget Office estimated 500,000 kids would be covered and most of the $16 billion in funding could be drained away by the States for other purposes. Democrats protested the Republican plan and voted unanimously for a motion to recommit that would implement the proposal of our health care task force.

The idea was to attach requirements that States actually use the money to insure kids through Medicaid or an alternative State health insurance plan. We insisted as Democrats that the direct services option, which allowed certain exemptions from using money to insure kids, be eliminated or severely curtailed. In addition, Democrats demanded an adequate benefits package for kids.

As the negotiations over the budget continued, Democrats joined in the series of letters to the budget negotiators urging inclusion of an additional $8 billion through a cigarette tax, and provisions intended to insure that all the new funds for kids' health care would supplement and not supplant current State efforts to provide children with health coverage.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans relented and the bill before us today includes $24 billion, requires that kids actually be insured with the money, and caps the direct services option to 15 percent of the funds.

The benefits package is adequate, in my opinion, and language is included so States have to spend at least what they do now on kids' health care.

Mr. Speaker, the kids' health care plan in this bill, in my opinion, is a major victory for the President and congressional Democrats. Thanks to Democratic values and perseverance, America's children will be the winners of this budget agreement.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the balanced budget legislation. When I ran for Congress, I pledged to the voters of my district that I would work to make the House more bipartisan and solution-oriented. This bill and my support of it is a reflection of that pledge. It is good for the residents of the central coast of California, it is good for our country.

I am very happy that we have increased the amount of funding for children's health care to $24 billion. It is unconscionable that millions of American children have no health insurance. I also strongly support the restoration of benefits for millions of legal immigrants who were callously cut off from disability benefits under last year's welfare reform bill. Today we are finally treating these individuals with the dignity they deserve. I urge my colleagues to vote for this historic and important bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss not the bill but the rule before us in this particular case.

Since I came here some 6 months ago or 7 months ago, it seems that all I hear from the party that said over and over again while it was in the minority is how it was going to do things better when it became the majority; in fact, all we hear now is, when they do something that is totally unconscionable, well, you did it, too, or you did another version of it.

In fact, that is not a good enough answer for people in this country, and I do not think people are going to be satisfied that this deliberative body or this body that is supposed to be deliberative spent virtually no time debating one of the more important bills that is going to come out of legislation this year.

The real issue is not whether we have this particular tax cut or this spending bill this year. There are larger issues in this country, not the least of which is what is happening to working families and why we have companies reporting 15 percent profits and 1 percent additional revenues, and we know the difference is because they are squeezing that out of American workers.

Those American workers have less health care benefits and they have less pension contributions, and they are told by employers that they are going to have the company move to Mexico or they are going to have replacement workers in if they try too hard to get a raise.

The real question is what does this tax package, what does this spending bill do for those American workers. And just a few minutes ago they said, we put it on the Internet, go read 20 inches of material and find the answer out for the voters. That is not appropriate. The American people say they want this body to deliberate. They want this body to know what is in that bill.

It is a darned good thing that I am a nocturnal sort of person, because since I have gotten here very little that is put on the floor by the majority is ever put on in the light of day, and very often that is because I suspect most of what they are putting forward will not suffer well the light of day.

In fact, this particular bill was delivered at 3:45 in the morning, and we have the audacity for the chairman of the Committee on Rules to say, like that is a great thing, like at 3:45 in the morning it was delivered to the minority member, ranking minority member, which gave us all plenty of time between 3:45 this morning and now to read 20 inches of documents and debate it and deliver it for the American people.

That is not conscionable. That is not right. This is not a good rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the previous speaker that he follow the rules of the House, and be a little careful about how he might reflect on the integrity or character of another Member.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE], who is a very valued member of the Committee on Rules, and someone who has been a true advocate of families and children in this Congress.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my enthusiastic support for this rule and for the Balanced Budget Act, and to point out to the last speaker, and to all the body, that we are already 50 percent fairer than the other party was in their rules in the last time they had control of this House.

What is exciting this day, Mr. Speaker, is that today Americans in this country, the earners, the savers, and the taxpayers, the people who play hard, work hard, take a few risks, strive every day to build a better future for their families and communities, are about to realize something for it.

For years, their message to us has been crystal clear. They wanted Congress to cut the tax burden on Americans. They wanted us to reduce Government spending and Government size. They wanted us to create new jobs and opportunities. They wanted us to shift power and influence to the States and local communities, where creative local solutions could take the place of broad Federal mandates. Most of all, they wanted us to balance the budget.

Finally, the message has sunk in. We are relearning the lessons of the 1980's, when we did cut taxes, when we did restrain Federal regulation and lower Government spending, because when we did those things prosperity made a huge comeback. Jobs were created, income started to rise, and people felt more secure about their economic futures.

Today we are about to kickstart that economic revolution again. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, we will actually balance the budget by the year 2002, the first time since 1969. That was the year I graduated from high school. That was the year Neal Armstrong walked on the Moon. That was a long time ago, Mr. Speaker.

Not only that, we are extending the life of Medicare for 10 years. We are saving it from bankruptcy, and giving seniors expanded options in meeting their health care needs.

At the same time, the Balanced Budget Act makes important investments in people, like the children's health initiative, preventive health programs, and the new welfare to work program to move welfare recipients off the public assistance rolls and into the payrolls.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the provisions in this historic legislation, and I commend the bipartisan negotiators who worked hard through many long days and nights to bring us to this conference agreement today.

I especially want to recognize my colleague, the gentleman from Columbus, OH, Mr. JOHN KASICH for his steadfast leadership in the fight to achieve a balanced budget over the years. Back in Ohio, we are so doggoned proud of Chairman KASICH that we could bust. Not only him, but all the negotiators that came up with this agreement are national heroes.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to begin a new chapter in our Nation's history. Let us seize it. Let us grasp this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. Vote for this rule. Support the conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake on what we are about here today; the cuts we are about to adopt today, with precious little debate, are to finance the tax cuts of tomorrow. There is a direct and irrefutable relationship. So the cuts in Medicare, the cuts in veterans' benefits, the cuts in Social Security Administration costs, are to finance tax cuts tomorrow. Tomorrow perhaps we will get the debate on the merits of the tax cut.

The point is, earlier the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Rules responded to my earlier statement saying, well, so the gentleman has not had time to read the bill. So there is only one copy. Now it is on the Internet. That is great. But he said earlier, he said, he should just rely on the judgment of some of his colleagues. Can he not follow them?

□ 1300

First off, I doubt that they have had an opportunity to read the entire bill. And secondly, no, I did not check my brain at the door when I got elected to Congress. I do not hand my voting card to anybody else. And to say that, well, the Democrats were abusive so we should not give them adequate time to read and review the bill, so we are going to do the same thing, I voted against those reconciliation bills when we had a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, and they kept shoving them through here and we did not have to read them.

I even signed a pledge never to vote for another one unless we were given a minimum of 24 hours to read it. No one has been given 24 hours to read however many thousand pages there are, and I do not know, because there is no index and it is not numbered. But it is probably a couple of thousand pages. Makes amazing changes.

I would ask the gentleman if he is particularly familiar with the cuts in veterans. We have an aging veterans population, and by the year 2002 we are going to see a reduction of $4.1 billion in veterans benefits in the year 2002 to achieve this theoretically balanced budget or, if one wanted to be more cynical, to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, a 19-percent cut.

How is it we are going to reduce veterans benefits with a dramatically aging veterans population, not just the World War II people and the Korean war vets, my own generation, the Vietnam generation, is beginning to develop aging problems. We cannot do it. It will not work.

We are not going to debate those veterans provisions here on the floor. We are not going to debate the merits of them. We are not going to be given time to even examine them. It took me a while to find them in this pile.

Let us talk about the Social Security administrative costs. Social Security is underfunded for administration, and it is paid for out of the trust fund. It is paid for out of the trust fund, yet we are going to cut Social Security administrative costs by 25 percent. So the next time that your mom or dad or your grandparents or the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in a few years tries to find out what has happened to their Social Security check, they are going to be put on indefinite hold. Right now it takes 3 months on the average to process a claim.

Under this legislation, it is going to take 6 months or 9 months, and with an aging population, who knows how bad it will get?

These are not the places to cut the budget. They are not fair cuts. In fact, I do not believe these cuts will ever be made. In fact, under this bill the deficit gets larger next year for the first time in 5 years. Is that not ironic? We are going to balance the Federal budget, but the deficit has been going down since 1992. Under this for the first time since 1992, the deficit goes on.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman is a veteran or not, but I am a veteran. I am a member of the AARP. Half of the AARP are made up of veterans and their families and they support this bill, as I do very, very strongly.

Second, if you read the bill, spending on veterans programs will rise each year with outlays increasing from 39.4 billion in fiscal year 1997 to 42.4 billion in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], a very respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of this budget. Together the budget and tax package we will pass this week demonstrate that hard work and able, commonsense leadership can balance the budget, cut taxes, and address critical unmet needs of our people responsibly and effectively.

With this budget we have won a great victory for our children. Three months ago people said Congress would not take action on children's health insurance this year and we are proving them wrong today. In this budget agreement we set aside $24 billion for a children's health insurance program under a law that allows States to structure their

program to effectively reach the uninsured children of working parents. Six million kids from working families, families who need and deserve our help, will get that help to ensure that their children will have the health care that they need. We have worked long and hard, and millions of children will lead healthy lives as a result of our bipartisan efforts today. This Congress should be proud of its accomplishments. There is no higher priority than protecting the health of our children.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see so many of my colleagues so eager to vote on this spending bill. They are excited. They cannot wait. And I know what it feels like. I know what it is like to vote for a deficit reduction package, to vote for a bill that puts our fiscal house in order.

I already cast my vote that makes a balanced budget a reality. None of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have ever done so. But I already did it. Did I sneak onto the floor last night to cast that vote? Or is it true what they say about Chicagoans, that we vote early and often?

Mr. Speaker, I cast that vote 4 years ago in 1993. I passed and voted for the largest deficit reduction package in U.S. history. It was a package that represented fairness, demanded shared sacrifice in the name of common good asked those of us who were doing well to share in the burden. Unfortunately those principles that just 4 short years ago appeared to be antiquated, out of style, and politically unpopular today, it was a package that passed without the vote of a single solitary member of the Republican Party. In fact, rather than standing with us in 1993, they stood and they jeered and they taunted us who voted for it. And yet look at the facts.

It is only thanks to what we did in 1993 that we can even consider this package today. You see, I hear a lot of my colleagues slapping each other on the back congratulating each other for doing something historic. Let me tell my colleagues about historic deeds and the people who were responsible for them, our veterans, men and women who fought for our country. And what does today's historic agreement mean to them? It means $2.7 billion in cuts to the VA medical services, $4.1 billion in cuts in total.

It means under this bill a low-income veteran who took a bullet or two at Iwo Jima or in Vietnam has to make another sacrifice to help an investor who wants to take a profit on Wall Street. It tells a veteran: You saved us from fascism in World War II; I hope you saved up some money, too, to pay for your health care; you are going to need it, now in your seventies and eighties.

Vote against this rule and these spending cuts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I very badly wanted to vote for this budget deal. I had expected I would be able to because I thought that the White House would hold out long enough to have a package that would truly be fair to average working Americans, and I am sorry that they did not do that.

I support three-quarters of this deal. I support the child tax credit. I was one of the original four sponsors of that proposal with Vice President GORE when he was then in the U.S. Senate. I am a sponsor of the education tax breaks because I believe in them deeply. I support the children's health care package. There is much that is going to be good in this deal. But there are certain standards that must be met when we are talking about distributing almost $600 billion of the people's money.

First of all, most of that relief should go to middle-income working families, not the economic elite of this country. Second, this bill should be used to close rather than widen the gap in income between the wealthiest 2 percent of the people in this society and everybody else.

Third, this should prevent the unraveling of Medicare and, last, it should not cripple the long-term investments necessary for our country to grow in the future.

These bills fail those tests. The most well off 5 percent of people in the country, as demonstrated by this chart, the most well off 5 percent of the people in this country, those who make $112,000 a year or more will gain six times as much tax relief in these bills as the 60 percent of the American people, well over a majority, who make less than $37,000 a year. That is not fair.

The wealthiest 1 percent of people in this society who make more than $250,000 a year will get a $16,000 tax cut under this proposal. But if you make under $19,000 a year, on average you will have a tax increase. That is not fair.

This package is also based on the assumptions, as have been indicated in the past, that we will cut the Social Security administration by 25 percent over the next 5 years. We already have a 3-month backlog now in handling Social Security cases.

Do we really believe Congress is going to vote for a package that will extend that waiting period for a year? We are told that we are supposed to cut health care by 16 percent over the next 5 years. The bill which will come to the floor later today for this year is going to raise National Institutes of Health spending by 6 percent. Are we really going to vote to raise it this year and then to cut it by 16 percent in future years? Come on. I cannot believe this House would be that dishonest.

Are we really going to vote to cut veterans benefits by 19 percent over the next 5 years? I cannot believe we would be that ungrateful.

Are we really going to vote to cut community development programs by 30 percent? Seventy percent of the funding to the community development block grant program or to FEMA for emergencies? We just raised the budget for FEMA. Are we really going to cut it 30 percent? Come on. Get real.

Are we really going to cut agriculture programs 23 percent over the next 5 years? Not if you come from agricultural districts, I will bet my colleagues. But those are the promises upon which this deficit reduction package is based. Those are false promises. I do not believe a majority of Members of either party will vote for those kinds of reductions when the time comes. That means the reality of this package in terms of the deficit is that we will be causing upward pressure, not downward pressure on the Federal deficit.

I am sorry about this today. I am sorry that we do not even have the chance to further examine this package. It is a national disgrace to make decisions over the future content of the Tax Code, to make decisions which will determine for 5 years or more what happens to people's pocketbooks, what happens to their education, what happens to their veterans benefits, it is unconscionable that that is going to be made without having at least 5 hours to review what is in this package. Who knows what other special gimmicks are wrapped into this package. Vote against this rule. Vote against these bills tomorrow. You do not know what is in them and you will come to regret what is hidden from the public in all of these packages.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, in 1 minute I do not have time to answer all of the charges by the last speaker.

I would point out that we are dealing with a tax cut of about $90 billion. About $70 billion of that $90 billion over the next 5 or 6 years goes to a $500-per-child tax credit for families that earn less than $110,000.

But I want to answer the charge that people have not had time to look through this bill. Here is the Medicare bill. It is not like this was just dumped on people's doorsteps last night. It is 95 to 98 percent of this bill that has been out there for weeks. This was what the House and the Senate passed. The great majority of this bill was agreed to weeks ago by the administration, and the House and the Senate.

Yes, there were some differences and in the last couple weeks there has been ample newspaper and news coverage of how we have come to a resolution on some of those contentious issues. I am very interested in this issue. So for those last final remaining items that were in dispute, all we have to do is look in those sections and know what is in the bill. For those who are interested in housing or veterans, the same thing applies.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for this time.

I again rejoice for this debate on the House floor because once again it points up some very important differences. I listened with great interest to the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations essentially call this exercise, and I believe I am using his words accurately, ''a national disgrace.''

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is a national disgrace to allow hard working people to hang onto more of their own money and send less here to Washington. I do not believe it is a national disgrace to allow for the reduction in the overall growth of spending, to make sure we save and preserve programs for Americans.

That is what we are doing with this Balanced Budget Act, as we work to preserve Medicare into the next generation, as we preserve veterans' benefits, as we work to make sure that this Government takes less money out of the pockets of working Americans, to allow them to keep more of their money to save, spend and invest as they see fit.

The fact that over 70 percent of these tax cuts go to families making under $75,000 is not disgraceful, it is the truth, and it is good for the American people.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, one of the most distinguished and respected Members of this body.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me this time.

It is very clear Bill Clinton will, by virtue of supporting this measure, be leaving one of the greatest Republican legacies in recent history, and we are very proud to be able to play a strong role in bringing that opportunity about.

This debate that has been going on has to do with whether or not Members have utilized Speakernews.House.Gov. When I last stood here, I said that it was on line. Obviously, I was a real visionary. It was about to be on line, and it now is there and available.

I did speak a little too soon, but the fact of the matter is virtually everyone has been following this debate. The Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference have been discussing this measure for a long period of time. We have had hearings, we have had debates on these issues for years in some cases.

I am particularly proud of several of the provisions that are included in this balanced budget agreement. One of them includes 390,000 demonstration cases for medical savings accounts. As we were discussing this up in the Committee on Rules earlier this morning, I mentioned the fact our former colleague French Slaughter and I, 12 years ago, introduced legislation called the health care savings account.

It was modeled after a package put together by the Center for Policy Analysis in Dallas, TX, and it actually was designed to be a successor to Medicare, because even more than a decade ago we were looking at the problems of Medicare and pursuing the idea of health care savings accounts. So I am hoping that these 390,000 demonstration cases will be a real plus and a benefit as we look at baby boomers moving toward retirement and the health care costs for retirees.

One of the other provisions that I think is very important is what is called the Disproportionate Share Hospital funding formula, known as DSH. It is not perfect from the perspective of a Californian, but I believe it goes a long way toward addressing a number of the very important concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point to this issue, which a number of us have been very sensitive to, specifically on our side of the aisle the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN], and a number of us from California, and that has to do with legal immigrants who could conceivably be thrown off of SSI. I believe as we look at the fact that a legal immigrant clearly is to have a sponsor, we did not want to see those who were elderly or infirm in any way jeopardized. This agreement addresses that.

Most important, it gets us right on to that glidepath toward a balanced budget, and I believe we have a very, very good opportunity to do that. That is why this is a great day for both the Republican and the Democratic Parties and all of the American people, and I urge strong support of the rule and then support for this package, and tomorrow the greatest tax cut that we have had in 16 years. I anxiously look forward to supporting that.

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

If the previous question is defeated, Mr. Speaker, I will offer an amendment to increase the debate time to 3 hours. Everybody is calling this measure an historic agreement. With only 90 minutes of debate, Mr. Speaker, there will not be much of an historical record.

Republicans refuse to give us sufficient time to read it; they should at least give us time to discuss it. So I ask that my amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that I may offer that amendment.

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

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

Earlier in the debate I mentioned that Ronald Reagan and this Member of Congress used to be John F. Kennedy Democrats until the Democrat Party abandoned Kennedy's principles and moved so far to the left.

I vividly recall back in 1962 that President John F. Kennedy, in introducing his tax cut plan to the American people, he, President Kennedy, stated, and this is a quote, ''Prosperity is the real way to balance the budget. By lowering tax rates, by increasing jobs and incomes, we can expand tax revenues and finally bring our budget into balance.''

President Kennedy was right then and the bills before us today are right also. Members should come to this floor, cast their vote to cut taxes, to cut spending, to balance the budget, to save Medicare and, most of all, to shrink the size and the power of this Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BOEHNER]. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Castle	Fawell
Archer	Chabot	Foley
Armey	Chambliss	Fowler
Bachus	Chenoweth	Fox
Baker	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Coburn	Gallegly
Barrett (NE)	Collins	Ganske
Bartlett	Combest	Gekas
Barton	Cook	Gibbons
Bass	Cooksey	Gilchrest
Bateman	Cox	Gillmor
Bereuter	Crane	Gilman
Bilbray	Crapo	Goode
Bilirakis	Cubin	Goodlatte
Bliley	Cunningham	Goodling
Blunt	Davis (VA)	Goss
Boehlert	Deal	Graham
Boehner	DeLay	Granger
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood
Bono	Dickey	Gutknecht
Brady	Doolittle	Hansen
Bunning	Dreier	Harman
Burr	Duncan	Hastert
Burton	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	Ehlers	Hayworth
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hefley
Calvert	Emerson	Herger
Camp	English	Hill
Campbell	Ensign	Hilleary
Canady	Everett	Hobson
Cannon	Ewing	Hoekstra

Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Blagojevich
Bryant
Fattah
Foglietta
Forbes
Gonzalez
Houghton
McCollum
McIntosh
Schiff
Young (AK)

☐ 1339

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO TWO SPECIFIED BILLS OF 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–219) on the resolution (H. Res. 203) providing for consideration of a joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two specified bills of the 105th Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

☐ 1345

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2015, BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 202, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOLOMON). Pursuant to House Resolution 202, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 29, 1997, Volume II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 45 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield that time to Members on my side in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. This obviously is the beginning of a very important debate and the beginning of a very exciting 2 days. We bring before the House today and tomorrow the first real budget in real terms with real savings starting immediately, for the first time adding up to a balanced budget for the first time since Neil Armstrong, a great American and fellow Ohioan, walked on the Moon. It will also be the first tax cuts to provide jobs and to help families for the first time in 16 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a lot of people out there that still think that this is all being done with disappearing ink, but at the end of these 2 days and upon the signing of the President of the United States, we should have a deal that commences the era that recognizes the limits of Government and begins to transfer power, money, and influence from this city.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my young protege the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this truly is a great day for America. What an exciting thing to be a part of out here. The first time since 1969. I was a sophomore in high school, the first time since I was a sophomore in high school, 1969, that we are actually going to balance the Federal budget. It is about more than words. It is about the hopes and dreams of the children in America today and the restoration of their opportunity to live the American dream. That is what this is all about today.

In 1995 the American people. And they should get credit for this, too, the American people had a mandate. The mandate was get us a balanced budget, get the tax burden off our back and restore Medicare for our senior citizens. Between today and tomorrow, we are going to make good on all three of those points.

To the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the committee on the budget, to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Speaker, to the folks on the other side of the aisle that were so actively involved and