



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1995

No. 108

## House of Representatives

The House met at 11:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KINGSTON].

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 29, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JACK KINGSTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Bless us, O God, and all Your people so the works of justice and mercy will have the center of our focus and an attitude of reconciliation and peace will be our goal. Help us to be aware, gracious God, that You have called us in this day and time to be people of character and integrity and in spite of any difference or dispute, may we seek to express the unity of Your creation that is Your gift to us. With humility and thanksgiving, with gratitude and praise, we receive this new day by Your promise and by Your grace. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] will lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HALL of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1058. An act to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes.

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996-2002

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 175

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996,

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. 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 one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The provisions in section 2 of this resolution shall be effective upon the adoption by the Congress of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

**SEC. 2. HOUSE CONFORMING CHANGES.**

(a) REVENUE INSTRUCTION IN THE HOUSE.—For the purposes of the compliance with reconciliation directions in the House under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, subclause (II) of section 105(a)(2)(B)(xii) of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996 shall be deemed to read as follows:

“(II) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee for fiscal year 2002 is not less than \$1,295,840,000,000 and for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 is not less than \$7,896,813,000,000.”

(b) HOUSE CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE.—Section 205 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996 shall not apply with respect to the House.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 provides for consideration of House Congressional Resolution 67, the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 thru 3002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6561

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Finally, the rule provides that the provisions in section 2 of the rule shall be effective upon the adoption of the budget resolution by the Congress. Section 2 of the rule clarifies the interpretation of two procedures as they apply to the House. First, the rule clarifies the House procedures for certifying a balanced budget are contained in section 210 of the conference report. Second, the rule provides the correct numbers for the level of revenue reconciled to the House Committee on Ways and Means. The numbers in the rule are consistent with the aggregate levels in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is consistent with the precedent set by the rules utilized for conference reports for 7 of the last 8 years. It will allow for a fair and reasonable debate on the substance of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today is truly a historic day.

Today we will consider the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 through 2002, in layman's terms our Nation's detailed fiscal path back to a sound financial footing.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will approve a balanced budget, something the naysayers and the protectors of the status quo said could not be done. Well, I stand here on the floor of the House today with all of my Republican colleagues to say we have done it, without raising taxes, without cutting Social Security, and without cutting veterans earned benefits.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us well know, formulating this historic package has not been easy. It has actually been very difficult, and quite frankly, in many parts of this country, has not even been totally popular but it has been the right thing to do.

But regardless of whether we agree with the results—and I personally do agree—of this effort, we all must commend those involved, for a sincere, upfront and realistic approach to dealing with this real fundamental problem of governing. In recognition of this I personally want to publicly commend, again, my colleagues on the Budget Committees of both Houses for their dedicated work. Specifically, I must also commend the leadership of JOHN KASICH on this vital issue. With the help of his committee, he has brought the immediacy of this issue into every home, business, and farm. He has fostered a complicated consensus of ideas—a consensus that will garner a majority vote in both Houses of the people's Congress.

As a result, this conference report represents the utilization of our cherished democratic process in resolving a serious national problem. This is how the process was intended to work.

In reference to the details of the conference report I must say that I personally am pleased with the outcome. The agreement of the House and Senate

represents a reorganization of our Nation's limited fiscal priorities in a way most conducive to the principles of federalism.

We all have our personal refinements that we would like to make to the agreement. I personally would have liked this bill to contain more money for defense and more department eliminations. Most of you also know that I would prefer to balance the budget sooner than 2002. However, the beauty of democracy is that it is premised on the need for consensus.

This conference report represents a consensus.

Consequently, I am proud to be part of this Republican Congress which has stuck to its promises, and stood by its convictions by presenting this balanced budget to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the final passage of this historic balanced budget resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the other side of the aisle has properly described this rule. It is a simple one which waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. It also provides for 1 hour of debate time equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Finally, the rule provides clarifying procedural language and the correct revenue amounts for reconciliation in section 2 of this rule which shall be effective upon final action on the budget resolution by Congress.

This is not an unusual rule for a conference report and I do plan to support it. However, Mr. Speaker, I have grave misgivings about the content of this budget resolution.

Although this resolution simply sets spending ceilings, and the implementing legislation, in many areas will come later, this resolution assumes cuts that many of us believe are simply too severe. You can look at this budget and see numbers—numbers in the millions, billions, and trillions. Yet there are faces behind those numbers. There are seniors, and working class families, and the poor. These are the people who will be hurt under this budget.

This resolution calls for a balanced budget by the year 2002, a laudable goal. Yet in order to get to this goal, this budget calls for cuts of \$270 billion in Medicare; \$180 billion in Medicaid; \$10 billion in student loans; and a 31-percent cut in nondiscretionary programs by the year 2002, including highway construction, air traffic control, meat inspection, and numerous education and training programs. I do not think the American people are aware of

the impact these kind of cuts will have on their everyday lives in 1, 2, or even 3 years.

The Medicare and Medicaid cuts alone account for more than one-third of the cuts in this bill. Yet last year's debate on health care reform pointed out the complexities of changing seniors' health care coverage. Medicare recipients, by and large, have worked hard their entire lives and they want the right to choose their own doctors. This budget takes a meat ax to the Medicare budget and seniors will suffer under it, as well as poor families and the disabled.

One of the most troubling aspects of this piece of legislation is the \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy and large corporations. To ask seniors and middle-class families to take the kind of hits they are going to get under this bill, and to then turn around and pass out tax breaks to corporations and those making over \$200,000 is simply ludicrous. If we are going to balance the budget we should at least try to do it in a responsible way. While the special interests have gotten a good deal under this package, the American public has not. The \$500 children's tax credit my colleagues on the other side like to talk about does not even touch really poor families, those making less than \$23,000. Middle-class families, making under \$100,000, will barely benefit from it. And the \$354 billion tax cut package already passed in the House, which I opposed, already offends this budget which calls for a \$245 billion cut for the wealthy.

The student aid cuts under this budget bill are too extreme. The average income of a family receiving student loans is \$35,000. Eliminating the interest subsidy, as called for in this budget, increases a student's indebtedness by 20 percent. This means an average student will pay \$5,000 more per student loan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot stand here today without expressing my disappointment over the dismantling of the child nutrition programs which occurred in the so-called welfare reform bill passed earlier in the year. This budget resolution assumes the enactment of the final package. Unless our colleagues in the other body correct the block granting of school lunch and other programs, millions of school children across the country will lose their school lunches.

For these reasons and others, I will be opposing this budget resolution when we have a chance to vote, and I urge my colleagues to take a very close look at its impact on middle-class Americans and the poor. However, as I indicated earlier, I have no objection to the rule which sets the terms of debate and I will be supporting it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on

Rules, a very valuable Member of this body who has done more to bring about this balanced budget than many people that I know. He is a very valuable Member.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, our distinguished Chairman, for yielding me this time and I rise in strong support of this rule, a very good and very special rule. Mr. Speaker, with this rule we will bring to the floor the central feature of the new majority's promise to the American people: a balanced Federal budget. We cannot forget the importance of this budget blueprint—every year since 1969 the Federal Government has spent more money than it had available in its coffers. Our total debt is now in the neighborhood of \$5 trillion, almost \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child. So it is an incredible feat that for the first time in over a quarter of a century, we have made a hard commitment to a balanced budget. And we have done this in spite of the lack of a balanced budget amendment, and in spite of a budget process that, at best, makes it extremely difficult to bring the budget into balance and at worst actually hinders the process of cutting waste and overspending.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the Blue Ribbon Bipartisan Entitlement Commission, known as the Kerry Commission, I have seen firsthand the problems that are lurking just around the corner if we do not fulfill our promise of balancing the budget. Asking the American people to put up with continued budget deficits is like asking them to paddle over Niagara Falls in a canoe, a predictably unpleasant outcome. Without serious reforms in all areas of the budget—including discretionary programs, including entitlements—we are setting the stage for certain tragedy.

Many people talk about the impact that the national debt and annual deficit will have on future generations, but the threat is actually much more immediate. Take Medicare for example: the trustees responsible for reporting on the state of this vital health program have said, plainly and simply, that Medicare will be broke in 2002—we are not talking about our children or grandchildren—this will have a direct impact on everyone from current retirees on down. This budget resolution addresses this crisis head on, and provides a platform to prevent a disaster—in Medicare and all other truly vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH of Ohio, for his tireless work in bringing this budget agreement to the floor. As he told us in committee, it is very important that we pass this conference report expeditiously, so that the various authorizing committees can fulfill their reconciliation goals and further us on the path to a balanced budget in 7 years. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the budget.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us who oppose this budget resolution that is before us, but support moving toward a balanced budget within 7 years.

Let me remind the House of the coalition budget, which is one example that was on the floor that would have provided for a balanced budget within 7 years with less borrowing than this budget resolution provides and would do it without the draconian cuts in our Medicare system or cuts in student financial assistance.

We can do that if we would only give up the tax breaks that are in the budget resolution that provide \$245 billion of relief to our wealthiest people. We can have a balanced budget without jeopardizing our Medicare system and without jeopardizing our students' ability for financial assistance. We can do better.

We should not put tax breaks for the wealthy ahead of a health care system for our seniors or the need for student assistance.

We can do better. We should do better. Let us defeat this budget resolution; let us bring out one that would not jeopardize senior health care and our students.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Muncie, IN [Mr. MCINTOSH], an outstanding new freshman Member of this body who has already made his mark.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

I think that a lot of us in the freshman class and a lot of us in the Republican conference supported the Contract With America and promised the American taxpayers that we would have tax cuts in this new Congress, and in the Contract we passed numerous tax cuts. We provided the family with a \$500 tax credit. We provided the elderly with a tax cut, repealing President Clinton's tax increase on Social Security. We provided small business men and investors a greater return on their capital investments, which will also stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Those promises were central to our effort last fall to go to the American people and explain to them why we needed a new majority in Congress.

I am proud to say that in the negotiations on this conference report, we were able to keep the bulk of those tax cuts. We were not able to keep all of them. Now, my preference would have been to keep every single one of them.

But I am here to say that I think this is a good step forward. I think we should support the conference report, but we should consider it to be a floor. This is the lowest amount the tax cuts that we can expect, and the freshman class and the conservatives in the conference and the Republican Party will be continuing to work for even more tax cuts so that we can be assured that we do repeal the Social Security tax

increase, we do give every family in America a full \$500 credit for every child, and we do give the full amount of capital gains tax cut. That is the standard that we will hold as we move toward reconciliation, and that is where we will be pursuing our efforts to fight on behalf of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good compromise and a good conference report. I rise in favor of the rule and the conference report.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, we all support a balanced budget. So why do I oppose this balanced budget proposal? Because I do not support balancing the Federal budget while you unbalance the budget of millions of American families. In West Virginia, for instance, 300,000 senior citizens will see their Medicare cut, that is right, cut, because when you pay over \$3,000 more out of pocket over a 7-year period, that is a cut.

We know that in West Virginia 35,000 students depend upon student loans, and there are student loan cuts in here as well that restrict growth and opportunity for the middle-income.

Because there is a tax cut for the wealthy in here at a time you are trying to balance the budget, to give two-thirds of West Virginia families \$90 or less, you are going to give 1 to 2 percent \$2,400 back in tax cuts. In other words, so that 1 or 2 percent over \$100,000 a year get \$2,400, you are going to cut 100 percent of senior citizens and their Medicare.

What happens is middle-income families lose the programs that are important to them.

I cannot support a balanced budget proposal that cuts Medicare, cuts economic growth and unbalances the family budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Appleton, WI [Mr. ROTH], a truly outstanding Member with whom I came to this body 17 years ago.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding me this time.

The budget resolution before us today will affect our trade and our budget policies, and this is very important to us.

Did you see this morning's paper? I know we have been in session all night long. I want you to read this morning's paper. It is the same old story: "The U.S. blows a lot of smoke, huffing and puffing and bluffing, and Japan walks away with all the dollars." I was somewhat surprised. I thought that President Clinton would stand strong. I really did. I was wrong.

The President came in weak, and he got weaker. The problem is last year we had a \$150 billion trade deficit. My friends, I want you to remember this number: This year our trade deficit is projected to be \$200 billion.

Do you know what that is going to do to our economy and to our workers? We just cannot keep going this way. We cannot keep doing that to our economy and to our workers.

It seems to me all too often people are only concerned about themselves and their group and no one is any longer thinking about our country. We cannot continue this way.

The President pulled a gun on Japan, and it turned out to be a water pistol, and the Japanese are laughing all the way back to Tokyo. We cannot keep going in this way. No one respects America anymore, and our other trading partners are laughing also.

This is a shell of an agreement. Read this. This is a shell of an agreement. It is not an agreement. It is an agreement for an agreement's sake. Our trade negotiator climbed way out on a limb, and the Japanese came along and sawed it off.

This agreement makes America weak, and, just as bad, it makes America look weak.

As the paper said this morning, the Clinton administration assault right here is a classic, notable for bellicose U.S. threats, not for significant results. Translated: American leadership is just hot air. Translated: What they are telling us is that American leadership is just a lot of hot air. That is not what American leadership should be and what we can expect from our administration.

On this resolution, instead of arguing back and forth like we have all night long, let us address this, not as Democrats and as Republicans, but as Americans. This is a big problem. Let us address it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], a very trusted and distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the rule and in opposition to the conference report that it makes in order.

Although the spending cuts and the tax cuts provided for by the conference report are not quite so extreme as in the House-passed version of the budget resolution, this plan still represents a massive transfer of resources from poor and middle-income Americans and from children and the elderly to the wealthiest Americans. This is a plan that hurts those who need the most help from Government and helps those who need it the least.

It is a blueprint for shifting budget priorities in a way we do not believe the majority of the people of our country support. We do not believe the people support cutting Medicare and Medicaid by \$452 billion. We do not believe that people support cutting domestic spending on a host of programs that represent investment in our Nation and that improve the quality of our lives, spending in such areas as education,

job training, transportation, environmental protection, science and health research. Those programs would be cut by nearly \$200 billion, or by nearly one-third in real terms from current levels.

We do not believe people support cutting all of these programs by such massive amounts. Just so the wealthiest Americans can benefit from a tax cut, particularly before we know whether we have actually achieved a balanced budget.

Many of us who will be voting against this conference report share the desire of the majority to balance the budget over the next 7 years, but we feel strongly there are far more fair and equitable ways to balance the budget than the one before us now.

□ 1200

For example, as Members recall, when the House considered the budget resolution last month, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] offered a plan that would also have balanced the budget by 2002. However, that plan would have avoided about \$140 billion of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that this conference report contains. It also would have protected many other important domestic programs, including education programs, from the extreme cuts contained in this budget plan.

There are two key reasons why the Stenholm-Orton plan was able to produce a balanced budget by the year 2002 without making such severe cuts. Unlike the majority's budget plan, it would not have cut taxes, and it would not have increased defense spending.

The contingent \$245 billion tax cut contained in this bill is one of the most troubling features of this plan. Although the details of the cuts are yet to be determined, most of the benefits of the tax cuts would likely go to the wealthiest families and corporations.

In addition, the tax cut is supposed to occur only if we cut spending enough to balance the budget. The fact is, however, the tax cut is not contingent upon reaching a balanced budget, as the Senate wanted, but upon a projection that a balanced budget will be achieved by 2002.

That projection would be based on highly questionable assumptions. One is that Congress will stay on the spending-cut path laid out by this resolution. Yet the cuts in this plan are so draconian that it is doubtful that they can be sustained over the next 7 years.

The contingency plan also assumes that there will be a \$170 billion so-called economic dividend—positive trends in interest rates, unemployment rates, and other economic indicators that will produce higher revenues and less spending. Yet, as we all know, even minor changes in such trends can produce huge budgetary differences.

If the objective of the majority was to provide a tax cut as a reward for balancing the budget, then a more honest and realistic approach would be to wait

until we actually achieve a balanced budget, rather than relying on a projection of a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to emphasize that many of us who will be voting against the conference report strongly support efforts to balance the budget over the next several years. In fact, many of us—particularly those of us who have spent many years fighting to bring our Nation's deficit problem under control—are pleased that this year, the debate has moved from whether we should balance the budget, to when and how it should be done. The Republican leadership, and in particular, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] deserves a great deal of credit for that change.

However, as I said earlier, we do object to the unfair and inequitable manner in which this budget resolution seeks to achieve that goal. For that reason, when the time comes to vote on the conference report itself, I urge Members to vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, obviously my friend and distinguished colleague, member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], for whom I have genuine affection and great respect, has pointed out there are many ways to balance the budget. I guess the debate is that we have found a way to do it and, under the leadership of the other party from the 40 years, we seldom have done it so we think we are making progress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE]. I would have to say that Ohio's loss of a jurist has been the Committee on Rule's very tremendous gain.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, let me first express my strong support for this very straightforward rule and acknowledge the hard work and dedication of Chairman SOLOMON in pursuing relentlessly this concept.

Second, I would like to commend my good friend and colleague from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, for his hard work and dedication in this effort. Like so many other pursuits, Chairman KASICH approaches the budget debate with passion and dogged determination.

He is guided by a clear sense of doing what is right for the American people, even if it means challenging the status quo with ideas or policies which some around here might consider politically unthinkable.

But doing the unthinkable, the politically difficult, is precisely what this budget debate is all about, Mr. Speaker.

After years of unbalanced budgets and reckless spending, we have the opportunity today, by adopting this conference agreement, to set a bold new course toward balancing the budget, limiting the size and scope of Government, and creating a meaningful future for all Americans.

Now, we have all heard the criticisms aimed at this very responsible budget plan. We have seen actual spending increases being called cuts, and the Budget Committee's good-faith efforts being portrayed as attacks on senior citizens and children.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this budget agreement offers solutions no more complicated or profound than those offered by responsible American families who, everyday, play by the rules, pay the bills, and make ends meet.

So, this debate really comes down to a simple choice. Do we continue following the old ways of doing business and piling up more debt? Or do we recognize that things have to change, and that the status quo is simply unacceptable if America expects to have any future.

I believe the will of the American people is clear: They want us to be bold, and to have the courage to make the difficult choices so that future generations of Americans will enjoy the good fortune and prosperity they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to reassure the American people that this Congress is serious about reducing the deficit and cutting spending. I urge my colleagues to adopt this responsible rule, and to pass this bold plan for securing America's future.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to see a lot of charts and numbers on this floor.

But this debate is not just about numbers. It's about people.

It is about the real effects these massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will have on real people.

People like Margaret Leslie.

Some of you will remember—last month I stood on this floor to talk about Margaret.

Today, Margaret is a proud senior citizen who lives in my district.

But 51 years ago—she was known to her friends as Margie the Riveter.

When she was young she answered the call of this country and helped build the B-29's that helped this country win the war.

Like most people of her generation, today Margaret lives on Social Security.

And after paying for her rent, her medicine, and her MediGap and Medicare premiums, she's left with about \$130 each month—to pay for food, bills, heat, and everything else.

And she struggles to make ends meet.

But instead of trying to make her life easier, this budget before us today will make her life harder.

The budget before us today takes us one step closer, a \$240 bite out of her Social Security check.

It takes us one step closer to the day when she has to pay an additional \$3,500 out of her pocket for Medicare.

It takes us one step closer to the day when her family will be forced to pay the bills that she can't.

Mr. Speaker, is this what we are all about as a nation?

Are these the values we hold dear?

Is this the message we're trying to pass along to our children and grandchildren?

Don't we have a responsibility to those who sacrificed so much for us?

Those of us who stand up for senior citizens and their families have been called fearmongers, with no vision of the future.

That is an insult to the senior citizens of this country.

Their concerns are real and need to be addressed.

The Gingrich Republicans keep saying they are making these cuts to save Medicare, to save the system, and I wish I could believe that.

But then I recall that 30 years ago, BOB DOLE voted against the very creation of Medicare.

I recall that 20 years ago, the majority leader campaigned on the theme of abolishing Social Security.

I recall that last January, the Speaker himself proposed abolishing Medicare and replacing it with a private system. That in February, the lead editorial in the Speaker's think newsletter read: "For Freedom's Sake . . . Eliminate Social Security."

And then I read just the other day that the majority leader's new book proposes to abolish Medicare and replace it with a private system.

So I say to my colleagues following the Gingrich revolution: don't come to this floor today and tell us that you're cutting Medicare to save Medicare, because all you've talked about the past 20 years is how we should abolish Medicare.

We wouldn't be in the Medicare situation we're in today if you hadn't come to this floor just 3 months ago and passed a bill that took \$87 billion out of the Medicare trust fund.

Where was your concern then? Where was your concern for saving the system then?

Let us be honest: You took money out of the trust fund then for the same exact reason you are cutting Medicare today: to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest people and the wealthiest corporations in our society.

We say the American people deserve better. People like Margaret Leslie stood by this country in times of war and peace. And we have a responsibility to stand by them today.

That is the sacred promise we made on Medicare, and it's time we live up to that promise.

I urge my colleagues: say no to this rule. And say no to this terrible budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] a hard-working and

energetic member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the previous speaker, the minority whip of the House, who in the second-to-the-last second in his peroration mentioned the rule. We are here to talk about the rule. It is a fair rule and a good rule. It is a rule that we should have had last night, when we had a wide open rule, and we watched petulant people, being like my children did when they were adolescents. I am embarrassed for our House, and I am embarrassed for what our country saw on television.

I would like to talk about the bill, just like the previous speaker did. We are here to balance the budget. For the first time since 1969, we think it is important to balance the budget. We are not balancing this budget to create tax cuts for the rich. People on Social Security with a \$40,000 income are not the wealthy but they are going to be benefited.

The 25-year-old couple with four children hoping to buy a home and save money for college, they are going to be benefited. The senior citizen who wants to sell an asset, wants to sell a home, wants to sell a business they built all of their lives, they are going to be benefited.

Then we are told that cuts are too deep. How deep? How long? When? When will you propose that we take this burden off the backs of our children and grandchildren?

The whole direction of what the previous speaker called the Gingrich revolution was to simply say that our children and our grandchildren are real people, too. I am delighted to meet Margie the Riveter. I think it is a wonderful story. But if you go to Margie the Riveter and say, we want your grandchildren to pay for your health care and the bills you have run up, she would not like that either.

The typical person on Medicare pays 24 percent of its costs over a lifetime. They do not want our grandchildren to pay for their care. For 30 years, for 30 years this Nation has voted itself wishes and dreams over needs and passed the bill onto our grandchildren. And that is, Mr. Speaker, immoral; \$5 trillion later, that is immoral.

I have got one grandson and I have another grandchild on the way. When that grandchild comes in November, if we do not do this, if we continue on the path of the last 30 years, that new grandchild will enter the world and during the course of his or her lifetime will pay \$187,000 just in interest on the debt. That is immoral. That is what we are about. When you see all the pictures up here and all the sob stories, remember this, America: Your children and grandchildren are real people, too.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Today we will

vote on a budget that would reduce Medicare spending by \$270 billion over 7 years. That is three times larger than any cut ever enacted in the history of Medicare. Let's not hide the facts. The magnitude of these cuts could decimate the only universal, portable health coverage we have in this country. When combining these cuts with steep reductions in Medicaid's coverage for nursing homes, the budget offers seniors a bitter pill to swallow.

Some have said that these cuts are needed to save Medicare. America knows better. The same budget that cuts Medicare by \$270 billion would also enact a \$245 billion tax break for the wealthy. This is not a fair trade for our Nation's seniors.

Let's not destroy Medicare in the name of saving it. I urge Members to think twice before they vote for a plan that breaks America's contract with Medicare beneficiaries.

This is not a fair trade for our seniors. We should not say we are going to take Medicare and change it as we know it today, a program that works, and we are going to save it in the process. The magnitude of these cuts goes much further.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I found it curious that the gentlewoman from Connecticut spoke so much about the tax on the seniors situation. The Republican platform, of course, does have a tax break for seniors. That has been much discussed and that means a lot to me, because I represent a lot of seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Salt Lake City, UT. [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, this rule that we are discussing will enable us to pass a budget document that irrevocably sets us on the road to a balanced budget. As a new Member of the House, I am proud to be part of this historic occasion, to be the first Congress in almost 30 years to pass a balanced budget.

For too long Congress has failed to balance the budget and, in so doing, we have failed the American people. This budget agreement is an important step toward restoring the budget's confidence and trust in our ability to lead this country toward a better future for our children, free of debt, full of opportunity, and we do it without raising taxes. In fact, we are going to reduce taxes on working families and we do not touch Social Security.

This budget will end business as usual in Washington. We eliminate loaded bureaucracies. We cut the waste out of Federal programs. We abolish programs that no longer work, and in doing so, we empower families and States and communities instead of Washington.

Importantly, this budget works to preserve and protect Medicare for current and future seniors, to stave off a looming bankruptcy in 2002 that would leave our seniors with no way to pay for their hospitalization.

The rule accompanying this resolution provides for fair consideration of

these critical issues by granting the traditional time given for debate on the budget conference agreement. None of us like every provision in the budget resolution, but it is time to move forward and allow this process to move forward.

Throughout the summer and throughout the budget process, we will continue to debate these issues and we will work out a solution that will keep us on course to a balanced budget and at the same time help us create a better future for every American family.

We owe the people who sent us here an honest debate, one where we do not call spending increases cuts, where we face the Medicare bankruptcy crisis head on and solve it instead of sitting on the side lines and criticizing and hoping no one notices that we do not offer solutions and where we stop trying to frighten the most vulnerable people in our population for political gain and truly work to help them improve their lives instead of frightening them for the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to balance the budget and stop running up the debt that our children will pay for what we are enjoying now. It is time for us to agree on the framework to balance the budget and reduce the deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the budget resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM.]

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, much less than a straightforward rule. I have been around here over 16 years now, and I have had a chance to see and to hear a lot of things, but this rule is truly an amazing document.

I am having a hard time understanding how a conference report signed by the conferees of both bodies can be two different bills in the bodies when it is being considered. It first came to my attention when I realized that the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans seemed to be talking about two different bills, at least when it came to the treatment of the tax cuts.

I understand how political spin works, how one person can talk about the trunk, the other about the tail, and both are talking about the elephant. But the differences here go beyond spin, and it all comes down to the rule we are considering.

Initially I was encouraged when I heard that the conference committee had agreed to postpone consideration of tax cuts until CBO reviewed the spending cuts and certified that the reconciliation bill will result in a credible path toward a balanced budget in 2002. That was what I heard my friend, Senator PETE DOMENICI, talking about. Despite my reservation about his health, agriculture, and education cuts, I suspect that if I were in the other body today, PETE might persuade me to vote for this rule and this bill.

But here in the House I read a different story, as I read this rule. This rule includes a self-executing provision that means it includes policy substance, not just procedure, which states, "section 205 of the concurrent resolution on the budget shall not apply with respect to the House."

Let me make sure everyone understands that. This rule starts our debate by saying, sure, we know we have a conference agreement, but even though the House agreed to it, we do not really have to abide by it. And just what is this section 205 that does not apply to the House? Well, it is the section that includes the requirement that CBO certify we put together a credible plan to balance the budget before we consider tax cuts. Instead, the House will be covered by a much weaker provision which allows tax cuts to be placed in the reconciliation bill before CBO has reviewed the package.

Even more disturbing, CBO is ordered how to do its business. CBO must give the House credit for the full economic bonus that results from a legitimate, steady, balanced budget plan. CBO itself has warned that the estimates of this economic bonus assume that the budget would be balanced smoothly over the next 7 years and would occur only if reductions are deemed credible. Does this plan meet those requirements necessary to earn the bonus? Well, it does not even begin a downward path until the third year.

All of these great and wonderful statements about this plan balancing the budget, oh, how I wish we were doing it credibly. But since CBO will be ordered to give the credit, the numbers will offer promises highly unlikely to be met.

Unfortunately, I have to encourage a no vote on this rule. Bring back a straightforward rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply refer the gentleman from Texas who is leaving the well to section 210 which is entitled "Tax Reduction Contingent on Balanced Budget in the House of Representatives," which I think will satisfy his needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER] vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sanibel for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong support of this rule. Clearly, this day is a very important one, not just the fact that we have stayed up all night here but the fact that we are bringing about a conference report that has been agreed to by both the House and the Senate, that is going to put us on that glide path toward a balanced budget.

Earlier several of my colleagues have been trying to tragically, once again, engage in this class warfare argument which we have been listening to for

such a long period of time. The "us versus them" case that they make really does not hold water, because I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an overwhelming number of the American people realize that we are in this together. We need both Democrats and Republicans alike, if we are going to move toward a balanced budget.

The President of the United States has, in response to our passage of a balanced budget, said that within 10 years he could balance the budget, angering many Members of his own party by pointing out some of the tough decisions that will have to be made. Unfortunately, our friends here in the House have continued to try and pit one group of Americans against another. I believe that this is very sad.

They have called us mean spirited, coldhearted. We have been accused of taking food from the mouths of babes. As we look at some of the programs that we have addressed in the first 6 months of the 104th Congress, it is very apparent, very apparent that only in Washington, DC, can a 4.5 percent increase, as we have put in the school nutrition program, be labeled a draconian cut. That is exactly what they have done with that issue. They have tried to do that with Medicare and a wide range of other things.

We desperately want to ensure that no American is hurt by this, but we also recognize that if we are going to have a balanced budget by the year 2002, tough decisions have to be made. That is exactly what happened in this conference report.

I am particularly gratified with the fact that this conference report is geared toward economic growth. I represent the state of California, which has an economy that is still going through a very very great difficulty, as it has for the past several years.

I believe that issues like the capital gains tax rate reduction will do more to create jobs, spur economic growth and not be a tax cut for the rich but help middle-income wage earners than virtually any Government program that we could put into place.

It seems to me that as this debate has proceeded, many Members have so often forgotten the fact that we want to do what we can to allow working Americans to keep some of their own hard-earned dollars. This is a very good conference report, and it is very fair rule. I support it strongly and thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

□ 1230

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

As the gentleman from California has noted, this House has been in session around the clock until just about an hour and a half ago. I just want to say that when it comes to protecting Medicare, when it comes to standing up for

America's middle class, if we have to be here around the clock another few days, the fight has only begun from the Democratic side, because we are not going to be bullied.

We are not going to permit committees to be stacked to implement this budget resolution by placing all the burden on Medicare recipients, by not doing anything about corporate welfare. We are going to stand up and tell the American people what is happening, and propose reasonable alternatives to that.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening with reference to Medicare? We have one new piece of the agenda since this rule was proposed by one of the Members of the Republican leadership. We have been concerned in the past debate of this budget that they were simply going to reduce benefits and increase out-of-pocket costs. That is the most likely thing to happen.

Now we are told there is a proposal that one of the ways this budget resolution, which is silent on the subject, will be implemented, one of the possibilities is to simply eliminate Medicare entirely for those Americans who are 65 or 66, and raise the eligibility age for Medicare, not lower it to cover more Americans, but to cut out of whole age bracket of people that are turning 65 and 66, as a solution to this proposal.

This particular budget is a day late and a dollar short. It is 2½ months late. It should have been approved April 15. They should not balance the budget on the backs of America's seniors.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to yield 3 minutes to the well-known gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this rules debate and the budget debate that is about to follow. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very, very important day for the House of Representatives, because we are now going to finalize a budget document that has been agreed on by the House and Senate that balances the budget in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting that we got here despite the words of the critics over the last several weeks and months. We might call them the "couldn't, wouldn't shouldn't" critics along the way. First of all, what they said was that we couldn't produce the fortitude to come up with a balanced budget. It simply would not happen. It did. A few weeks ago we brought to the House floor a balanced budget document.

Then the critics all said, "Well, maybe they could do it, but they wouldn't do it for real, because after all, when it got to the Senate, it was simply not going to happen." But, lo and behold, the Senate and the House have met now and there is a budget document that balances the budget in 7

years, and does so by beginning the process of downsizing the Federal Government.

The American people said clearly last year, "Government is too big. It spends too much." We now have a budget that reflects the priority of Government being too big and spending too much, and we begin the process of reform, restructuring, and relooking at the whole mechanism.

Now what do we hear from the critics? Listen to them out here today. Now they say we should not do it. First they said we couldn't, then they said we wouldn't, now they say we shouldn't. Why shouldn't we do it? Because they have all of these horror stories by people they say will be hurt by the budget. Of course, they have contributed nothing, nothing toward the reform. They have contributed nothing to the process.

In fact, what they have done throughout the process is peddled kind of fear and smear about the whole idea. They have tried to peddle fear as a way of telling people they should not be able to watch this budget process. Then they have tried to smear the whole process by suggesting there was something wrong with it from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that just as they were wrong when they said we couldn't do it, just as they were wrong when they said we wouldn't do it, they are also wrong when they say we shouldn't do it, because the fact is here is an opportunity, unlike any opportunity we have had for many, many years in this country, an opportunity to truly move toward a balanced budget and do so in a reasonable, responsible way, in a way that reforms the Government structures.

It is a shame. It is a shame that the forces of the status quo, it is a shame that the interest groups, are so intent upon keeping in place those things that they have built in the Federal Government structure that they now say we couldn't do it, we wouldn't do it, and now they are saying we shouldn't do it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would say you can't, you won't, and you didn't do it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this budget resolution. As we approach the vote on the budget resolution, I feel there is a lemming-like atmosphere in this Chamber. Many are ready and willing to take the plunge without questioning the consequences.

I think we can all agree reducing the deficit is our No. 1 priority. However, we differ on the approach to reach this goal. The budget resolution before us today is a new version of survival of the fittest and many of my constituents will not survive without being bruised and battered.

To achieve deficit reduction, this resolution is slashing several valuable

programs such as the earned income tax credit. By the time we finish with budget reconciliation, the earned income tax could be dramatically changed. The amount of the earned income tax may be kept at the same level and fully phased in and this could result in over 18,000 of my constituents paying a tax increase. This resolution will limit the earned income tax credit, but includes a large tax cut which will most likely include a capital gains tax cut indexed for inflation which will help the wealthy.

This resolution calls for large cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. These cuts are too deep. We cannot refuse to help the elderly and poor when they are sick.

This resolution contains a sizable decrease in spending on education. Education is integrally linked to our future. Many of my constituents worry about the rising costs of a college education.

It is time to reduce the deficit, but we have to proceed in an efficient and cautious manner. There are many points both sides of the aisle can agree upon. We should use these as our starting point and go back to the drawing board.

The resolution before us today paints a bleak future for many. We can and should do better.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what has happened to the idea of a caring and compassionate Nation. The people of this country have stood up through so many challenges throughout our history, and yet now, when we face a major financial crisis, instead of standing up to Star Wars and the B-2 bomber, instead of standing up to corporate welfare, we put our gunsights on the poor.

We say to senior citizens that we are going to cut the health care programs that they depend on. We say we are going to eliminate the fuel assistance program, we are going to cut the stu-

dent aid programs, we are going to eliminate our capability of having a country that invests in our own people.

We tell little children that are going to be abused that we no longer have enough money to provide foster care, we do not have enough money to find them a hot lunch, but my goodness, when it comes to providing a big tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country, we can come up with \$245 billion. Maybe it is time that we look at ourselves and where we are headed in this country, and whether or not we want to just glad-hand votes around here, going out to the American people and telling them we can have a tax cut, and eliminate the deficit at the same time; or maybe we ought to be talking about real leadership, how this country is going to enter the 21st century, providing good jobs for the American people that are going to require an education, that are going to require serious job training, to be able to get us to the high-skilled jobs that are going to go either to the Germans or Japanese or to the American people. Those are the challenges we need to accept as a people.

If those challenges were reflected in this budget, I would vote for it. They are not, and therefore, I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes, the remaining time, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, like many others, rise strongly in objection to this rule and to the conference report, which I know will follow, because the majority has the votes. They will pass the previous question and they will pass the rule and they will pass the conference report.

However, Mr. Speaker, we all know that this conference report, as the gen-

tleman from Texas pointed out, is really not a complete agreement between the House and Senate; that there are differences between the House and Senate still remaining as far as taxes and revenues are concerned. There are differences between the two bodies. As far as other provisions, there are still differences.

It is common knowledge, the House is to do one thing and the Senate is to do another, and I guess somewhere down the road, later on this year or next year or the following year, they might meet and come together. It is not a complete conference agreement, as we have always known in this House, in the past history of this House, ever since we have had the statutory budgetary law. This is the first time that I know of, at least in the 19 years, 19 budgets that I have been here to vote on, it is the first time that I have ever seen one that is not really an agreement, but they have agreed basically to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote against the previous question, to vote against the rule, and then to vote against the conference report. It is not only those things that are bad about this conference report, but it is what the implementing legislation needs to do in order to meet the targets that are in the conference report in the budget.

In the first place, it has been pointed out, again by the gentleman from Texas, that there are really not that many cuts in many of the programs in the initial couple of years, so when we look at it, it is just a questionable thing whether after 7 years they are really going to get a balanced budget. There are assumptions in this conference report that no one knows are going to happen. Mr. Speaker, this is not a conference report for a balanced budget.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following document regarding floor procedure.

The document referred to is as follows:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance .....	H. Res. 6	Closed .....	None
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package .....	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule .....	None
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates .....	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget .....	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes .....	2R; 4D
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling .....	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments .....	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto .....	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995 .....	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments .....	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act .....	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision .....	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants .....	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act .....	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas .....	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments .....	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance .....	N/A	Closed: Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection .....	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act .....	H. Res. 91	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority .....	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute .....	1D
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium .....	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference .....	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment .....	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments .....	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility .....	H. Res. 100	Open .....	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act .....	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery of the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D;1R
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open: waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. XXX	Closed: provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive: Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A

\* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. \*\* All legislation, 63% restrictive; 37% open. \*\*\* Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. \*\*\*\* Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that this is the closing minute, I would just like to make a couple of quick remarks. There was some comment from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] that maybe the House and Senate have not got it exactly fitted together. They certainly have it exactly fitted together a whole lot better than the Clinton administration does.

The budget that has been set up here by the President was a nonstarter, and I remember the President, in a place in an approximate position next to the gentleman in the Chair, as he was addressing the joint session said, "It is the CBO who will make the judgment," and the CBO made the judgment and his budget was found wanting, seriously wanting and out of balance.

We have been just told that we can expect some dilatory tactics, more ef-

fort to obfuscate and interfere with the proper business of the people of this country being done in an efficient way by the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite our colleagues in the minority on the other side to put as much effort as they are putting into the rhetoric on this issue, I would ask them to give that much energy into working in cooperation with the majority, so that every American has a better quality of life. The way to start that is to vote for this rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. HALL of Ohio. 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—233

Allard	Armey	Baker (CA)
Archer	Bachus	Baker (LA)

Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combust  
Cooley  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman

Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ingليس  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney

NAYS—181

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

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

Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Petry  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souders  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markley

Bliley  
Canady  
Condit  
Cox  
Cubin  
Fattah  
Houghton

Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers

NOT VOTING—20

Kaptur  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Moakley  
Reynolds  
Seastrand  
Skaggs

Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—236

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

NOES—183

Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ingليس  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:  
Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. BAESLER, MATSUI, and MORAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE  
Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

Doyle	Lantos	Pomeroy	Barton	Goodling	Ney	Gordon	McCarthy	Roemer
Durbin	Levin	Poshard	Bass	Goss	Norwood	Green	McDermott	Rose
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Bateman	Graham	Nussle	Gutierrez	McHale	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lincoln	Rangel	Bereuter	Greenwood	Oxley	Hamilton	McNulty	Rush
Eshoo	Bilipinski	Reed	Bilbray	Gunderson	Packard	Harman	Meehan	Sabo
Evans	Lofgren	Richardson	Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Parker	Hastings (FL)	Meek	Sanders
Farr	Lowey	Rivers	Blute	Hall (OH)	Paxon	Hayes	Menendez	Sawyer
Fazio	Luther	Roemer	Boehlert	Hall (TX)	Petri	Hefner	Mfume	Schroeder
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Rose	Boehner	Hancock	Pombo	Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Schumer
Filner	Manton	Roybal-Allard	Bonilla	Porter	Porter	Hinchey	Mineta	Serrano
Flake	Markey	Rush	Bono	Hastert	Portman	Holden	Minge	Sisisky
Foglietta	Martinez	Sabo	Brownback	Hastings (WA)	Pryce	Hoyer	Mink	Skaggs
Ford	Mascara	Sanders	Bryant (TN)	Hayworth	Quillen	Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Skelton
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Sawyer	Bunn	Hefley	Quinn	Jacobs	Montgomery	Slaughter
Frost	McCarthy	Schroeder	Bunning	Heineman	Radanovich	Jefferson	Moran	Spratt
Furse	McDermott	Schumer	Burr	Herger	Ramstad	Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Stark
Gejdenson	McHale	Scott	Burton	Hilleary	Regula	Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Stenholm
Gephardt	McNulty	Serrano	Buyer	Hobson	Riggs	Kennedy (MA)	Oberstar	Studds
Geren	Meehan	Sisisky	Callahan	Hoekstra	Roberts	Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Stupak
Gibbons	Meek	Skaggs	Calvert	Hoke	Rogers	Kennelly	Olver	Tanner
Gonzalez	Menendez	Skelton	Camp	Horn	Rohrabacher	Kildee	Ortiz	Tejeda
Gordon	Mfume	Slaughter	Castle	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen	Klecza	Orton	Thompson
Green	Miller (CA)	Spratt	Chabot	Hunter	Roth	Klink	Owens	Thornton
Gutierrez	Mineta	Stark	Chambliss	Hutchinson	Roukema	LaFalce	Pallone	Thurman
Hall (OH)	Minge	Stenholm	Chenoweth	Hyde	Royce	Lantos	Pastor	Velazquez
Harman	Mink	Studds	Chenoweth	Hyde	Royce	Levin	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Stupak	Christensen	Inglis	Salmon	Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Hefner	Montgomery	Tanner	Christensen	Istook	Sanford	Lincoln	Pelosi	Volkmer
Hilliard	Moran	Moran	Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Saxton	Lipinski	Peterson (FL)	Ward
Hinchey	Murtha	Thompson	Coble	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough	Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Watt (NC)
Holden	Nadler	Thornon	Coburn	Jones	Schaefer	Luther	Pickett	Waxman
Hoyer	Neal	Thurman	Collins (GA)	Kanjorski	Schiff	Maloney	Pomeroy	Williams
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Velazquez	Combest	Kasich	Seastrand	Mantony	Poshard	Wilson
Jacobs	Obey	Vento	Cooley	Kim	Sensenbrenner	Manton	Rahall	Wise
Jefferson	Olver	Visclosky	Cox	King	Shaw	Markey	Rangel	Woolsey
Johnson (SD)	Ortiz	Volkmer	Crane	Kingston	Shays	Martinez	Reed	Wyden
Johnson, E. B.	Orton	Ward	Cremeans	Klug	Shuster	Mascara	Richardson	Wynn
Johnston	Owens	Watt (NC)	Cubin	Knollenberg	Skeen	Matsui	Rivers	Yates
Kanjorski	Pallone	Waxman	Cunningham	Kolbe	Smith (MI)			
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Williams	Davis	LaHood	Smith (NJ)			
Kennedy (RI)	Payne (NJ)	Wilson	Deal	Largent	Smith (TX)			
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Wise	DeLay	Latham	Smith (WA)			
Kildee	Pelosi	Woolsey	Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Solomon			
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Wyden	Dickey	Laughlin	Souder			
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Wynn	Doolittle	Lazio	Spence			
LaFalce	Pickett	Yates	Dorman	Leach	Stearns			
			Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Stockman			
			Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Stump			
			Dunn	Lightfoot	Talent			
			Ehlers	Linder	Tate			
			Ehrlich	Livingston	Tauzin			
			Emerson	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)			
			English	Longley	Taylor (NC)			
			Ensign	Lucas	Thomas			
			Everett	Manzullo	Thornberry			
			Ewing	Martini	Tiaht			
			Fawell	McCollum	Torkildsen			
			Fields (TX)	McCrery	Trafficant			
			Flanagan	McDade	Upton			
			Foley	McHugh	Waldholtz			
			Forbes	McInnis	Walker			
			Fowler	McIntosh	Walsh			
			Fox	McKeon	Wamp			
			Franks (CT)	Metcalf	Watts (OK)			
			Franks (NJ)	Meyers	Weldon (FL)			
			Frelinghuysen	Mica	Weldon (PA)			
			Frisa	Miller (FL)	Weller			
			Funderburk	Molinar	White			
			Gallegly	Moorhead	Whitfield			
			Ganske	Morella	Wicker			
			Gekas	Murtha	Wolf			
			Gilchrest	Myers	Young (AK)			
			Gillmor	Myrick	Young (FL)			
			Gilman	Nethercutt	Zeliff			
			Goodlatte	Neumann	Zimmer			

NOT VOTING—15

Bliley	Kaptur	Torres
Canady	McKinney	Torricelli
Condit	Moakley	Towns
Fattah	Reynolds	Tucker
Houghton	Stokes	Waters

□ 1323

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 180, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—234

Allard	Bachus	Barr
Archer	Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)
Army	Baker (LA)	Bartlett

Barton	Bass	Bateman	Bereuter	Bilbray	Bilirakis	Blute	Boehlert	Boehner	Bonilla	Bono	Brownback	Bryant (TN)	Bunn	Bunning	Burr	Burton	Buyer	Callahan	Calvert	Camp	Castle	Chabot	Chambliss	Chenoweth	Christensen	Chryslers	Clinger	Coble	Coburn	Collins (GA)	Combest	Cooley	Cox	Crane	Crapo	Cremeans	Cubin	Cunningham	Davis	Deal	DeLay	Diaz-Balart	Dickey	Doolittle	Dorman	Dreier	Duncan	Dunn	Ehlers	Ehrlich	Emerson	English	Ensign	Everett	Ewing	Fawell	Fields (TX)	Flanagan	Foley	Forbes	Fowler	Fox	Franks (CT)	Franks (NJ)	Frelinghuysen	Frisa	Funderburk	Gallegly	Ganske	Gekas	Gilchrest	Gillmor	Gilman	Goodlatte
--------	------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	-------	----------	---------	---------	------	-----------	-------------	------	---------	------	--------	-------	----------	---------	------	--------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-----------	---------	-------	--------	--------------	---------	--------	-----	-------	-------	----------	-------	------------	-------	------	-------	-------------	--------	-----------	--------	--------	--------	------	--------	---------	---------	---------	--------	---------	-------	--------	-------------	----------	-------	--------	--------	-----	-------------	-------------	---------------	-------	------------	----------	--------	-------	-----------	---------	--------	-----------

NAYS—180

Abercrombie	Chapman	Dooley
Ackerman	Clay	Doyle
Andrews	Clayton	Durbin
Baessler	Clement	Edwards
Baldacci	Clyburn	Engel
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	Eshoo
Becerra	Collins (IL)	Evans
Beilenson	Collins (MI)	Farr
Bentsen	Conyers	Fazio
Berman	Costello	Fields (LA)
Bevill	Coyne	Filner
Bishop	Cramer	Flake
Bonior	Danner	Foglietta
Borski	de la Garza	Ford
Boucher	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Brewster	DeLauro	Frost
Browder	Dellums	Furse
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Gejdenson
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gephardt
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Geren
Bryant (TX)	Dixon	Gibbons
Cardin	Doggett	Gonzalez

Goodling	Goss	Graham	Greenwood	Hansen	Hastert	Hastings (WA)	Hayworth	Hefley	Heineman	Herger	Hilleary	Hobson	Hoekstra	Hoke	Horn	Hostettler	Hunter	Hutchinson	Hyde	Inglis	Istook	Johnson (CT)	Johnson, Sam	Jones	Kanjorski	Kasich	Kelly	Kim	King	Kingston	Klug	Knollenberg	Kolbe	LaHood	Largent	Latham	LaTourette	Laughlin	Lazio	Leach	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (KY)	Lightfoot	Linder	Livingston	LoBiondo	Longley	Lucas	Manzullo	Martini	McCollum	McCrery	McDade	McHugh	McInnis	McIntosh	McKeon	Metcalf	Meyers	Mica	Miller (FL)	Molinar	Moorhead	Morella	Murtha	Myers	Myrick	Nethercutt	Neumann
----------	------	--------	-----------	--------	---------	---------------	----------	--------	----------	--------	----------	--------	----------	------	------	------------	--------	------------	------	--------	--------	--------------	--------------	-------	-----------	--------	-------	-----	------	----------	------	-------------	-------	--------	---------	--------	------------	----------	-------	-------	------------	------------	-----------	--------	------------	----------	---------	-------	----------	---------	----------	---------	--------	--------	---------	----------	--------	---------	--------	------	-------------	---------	----------	---------	--------	-------	--------	------------	---------

Ney	Norwood	Nussle	Oxley	Packard	Parker	Paxon	Petri	Pombo	Porter	Portman	Pryce	Quillen	Quinn	Radanovich	Ramstad	Regula	Riggs	Roberts	Rogers	Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen	Roth	Roukema	Royce	Salmon	Sanford	Saxton	Scarborough	Schaefer	Schiff	Seastrand	Sensenbrenner	Shaw	Shays	Shuster	Skeen	Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)	Solomon	Souder	Spence	Stearns	Stockman	Stump	Talent	Tate	Tauzin	Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)	Thomas	Thornberry	Tiaht	Torkildsen	Trafficant	Upton	Waldholtz	Walker	Walsh	Wamp	Watts (OK)	Weldon (FL)	Weldon (PA)	Weller	White	Whitfield	Wicker	Wolf	Young (AK)	Young (FL)	Zeliff	Zimmer
-----	---------	--------	-------	---------	--------	-------	-------	-------	--------	---------	-------	---------	-------	------------	---------	--------	-------	---------	--------	-------------	--------------	------	---------	-------	--------	---------	--------	-------------	----------	--------	-----------	---------------	------	-------	---------	-------	------------	------------	------------	------------	---------	--------	--------	---------	----------	-------	--------	------	--------	-------------	-------------	--------	------------	-------	------------	------------	-------	-----------	--------	-------	------	------------	-------------	-------------	--------	-------	-----------	--------	------	------------	------------	--------	--------

Gordon	Green	Gutierrez	Hamilton	Harman	Hastings (FL)	Hayes	Hefner	Hilliard	Hinchey	Holden	Hoyer	Jackson-Lee	Jacobs	Jefferson	Johnson (SD)	Johnson, E. B.	Kennedy (MA)	Kennedy (RI)	Kennelly	Kildee	Klecza	Klink	LaFalce	Lantos	Levin	Lewis (GA)	Lincoln	Lipinski	Lofgren	Lowe	Luther	Maloney	Mantony	Markey	Martinez	Mascara	Matsui
--------	-------	-----------	----------	--------	---------------	-------	--------	----------	---------	--------	-------	-------------	--------	-----------	--------------	----------------	--------------	--------------	----------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------	-------	------------	---------	----------	---------	------	--------	---------	---------	--------	----------	---------	--------

McCarthy	McDermott	McHale	McNulty	Meehan	Meek	Menendez	Mfume	Miller (CA)	Mineta	Minge	Mink	Mollohan	Montgomery	Moran	Nadler	Neal	Oberstar	Obey	Olver	Ortiz	Orton	Owens	Pallone	Pastor	Payne (NJ)	Payne (VA)	Pelosi	Peterson (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Pickett	Pomeroy	Poshard	Rahall	Rangel	Reed	Richardson	Rivers
----------	-----------	--------	---------	--------	------	----------	-------	-------------	--------	-------	------	----------	------------	-------	--------	------	----------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------	--------	------------	------------	--------	---------------	---------------	---------	---------	---------	--------	--------	------	------------	--------

NOT VOTING—20

Ballengar	Johnston	Torres
Barcia	Kaptur	Torricelli
Bliley	McKinney	Towns
Canady	Moakley	Tucker
Condit	Reynolds	Vucanovich
Fattah	Scott	Waters
Houghton	Stokes	

□ 1333

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which this resolution, House Resolution 175, was adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Ohio did vote in favor of the resolution and is qualified to make the motion.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—236

Allard	Ganske	Nethercutt
Archer	Gekas	Neumann
Armey	Gilchrest	Ney
Bachus	Gillmor	Norwood
Baker (CA)	Gilman	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Barr	Goodling	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Parker
Bartlett	Graham	Paxon
Barton	Greenwood	Petri
Bass	Gunderson	Pombo
Bateman	Gutknecht	Porter
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Portman
Bilbray	Hamilton	Pryce
Bilirakis	Hancock	Quillen
Bliley	Hansen	Quinn
Blute	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehrlert	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Boehner	Hayworth	Riggs
Bonilla	Hefley	Roberts
Bono	Heineman	Rogers
Brownback	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hobson	Rose
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roth
Burr	Hoke	Roukema
Burton	Horn	Royce
Buyer	Hostettler	Salmon
Callahan	Hunter	Sanford
Calvert	Hutchinson	Saxton
Camp	Hyde	Scarborough
Canady	Inglis	Schaefer
Castle	Istook	Schiff
Chabot	Jacobs	Seastrand
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Christensen	Jones	Shaw
Chrysler	Kanjorski	Shays
Clinger	Kasich	Shuster
Coble	Kelly	Skeen
Coburn	Kim	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cox	Knollenberg	Solomon
Crane	Kolbe	Souder
Crapo	LaHood	Spence
Cremeans	Largent	Stearns
Cubin	Latham	Stockman
Cunningham	LaTourette	Stump
Davis	Laughlin	Talent
Deal	Lazio	Tate
DeLay	Leach	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dornan	Linder	Thornberry
Dreier	Livingston	Tiaht
Duncan	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Dunn	Longley	Trafigant
Ehlers	Lucas	Upton
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Vucanovich
English	Martini	Waldholtz
Ensign	McCollum	Walker
Everett	McCrery	Walsh
Ewing	McDade	Wamp
Fawell	McHugh	Watts (OK)
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
Flanagan	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Foley	McKeon	Weller
Forbes	Metcalf	White
Fowler	Meyers	Whitfield
Fox	Mica	Wicker
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Franks (NJ)	Molinari	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Frisa	Morella	Zeliff
Funderburk	Myers	Zimmer
Galleghy	Myrick	

NOES—182

Abercrombie	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Ackerman	Brewster	Conyers
Andrews	Browder	Costello
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Danner
Barrett (WI)	Bryant (TX)	de la Garza
Becerra	Cardin	DeFazio
Beilenson	Chapman	DeLauro
Bentsen	Clay	Dellums
Berman	Clayton	Deutsch
Bevill	Clement	Dicks
Bishop	Clyburn	Dingell
Bonior	Coleman	Dixon
Borski	Collins (IL)	Doggett

Dooley	Lantos	Pomeroy
Doyle	Levin	Poshard
Durbin	Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Edwards	Lincoln	Rangel
Engel	Lipinski	Reed
Eshoo	Lofgren	Richardson
Evans	Lowe	Rivers
Farr	Luther	Roemer
Fazio	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Fields (LA)	Manton	Rush
Filner	Markey	Sabo
Flake	Martinez	Sanders
Foglietta	Mascara	Sawyer
Ford	Matsui	Schroeder
Frank (MA)	McCarthy	Schumer
Frost	McDermott	Serrano
Furse	McHale	Sisisky
Gejdenson	McNulty	Skaggs
Gephardt	Meehan	Skelton
Geren	Meek	Slaughter
Gibbons	Menendez	Spratt
Gonzalez	Mfume	Stark
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Green	Mineta	Studds
Gutierrez	Minge	Stupak
Hall (OH)	Mink	Tanner
Harman	Mollohan	Tejeda
Hastings (FL)	Montgomery	Thompson
Hayes	Moran	Thornton
Hefner	Murtha	Thurman
Hilliard	Nadler	Towns
Hinchey	Neal	Velazquez
Holden	Oberstar	Vento
Hoyer	Oliver	Visclosky
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Volkmer
Jefferson	Ortiz	Ward
Johnson (SD)	Orton	Watt (NC)
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Waxman
Johnston	Pallone	Williams
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Wilson
Kennedy (RI)	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Woolsey
Kildee	Pelosi	Wyden
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Wynn
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Yates
LaFalce	Pickett	

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger	McKinney	Torres
Condit	Moakley	Torrice
Emerson	Radanovich	Tucker
Fattah	Reynolds	Waters
Houghton	Scott	
Kaptur	Stokes	

□ 1352

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. POMEROY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 175, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 175, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1995, at page H6273.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today truly is an historic day as we come to this floor after a long and difficult, contentious night. This is an opportunity, however, to deliver on our promises, to keep our word, and we will be doing it today on a bipartisan basis. We will be out here with Members on the other side of the aisle, recognizing the fact that balancing the budget and giving people some of their money back as we downsize Government is what the American people have asked for.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people were skeptical about the ability of Republicans and our Democrat friends to be able to put a plan together that in fact could balance the budget over 7 years and to provide that tax relief, but we come here today not with rhetoric. We come here today with specifics, and we come here today with a commitment to see this job done through the year 2002 and to keep our word.

Obviously this has been something that politicians have talked about for an awful long time, but it is wonderful that today politicians come here not just with rhetoric, but the deeds that back up the language they have been using. I think it is a great day for our country.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. Like the many seniors who have contacted me, I was shocked to learn that the Republican budget slashes Medicare by \$270 billion. And as if that were not enough, the Republicans slash another \$180 billion from Medicaid. In my State of Michigan, close to two-thirds of Medicaid is spent on the elderly poor.

This is an attack, plain and simple, on America's senior citizens and on the working parents who are being squeezed between love for their own parents and grandparents, on the one hand, and their children on the other. That is the cruel choice being imposed on the average American by the Republican budget.

Sadly, the Republicans are playing "hide the ball" with their plans for reforming Medicare and Medicaid. The current legislative schedule allows for only 9 days in September to introduce, review, and vote on the proposed changes. If the Republicans have such wonderful ideas for ensuring the solvency of Medicare, turning Medicaid over to the States, and still protecting the health of our seniors, why are they keeping them a secret? What are they afraid of?

It appears that they trying to sneak their radical and extreme cuts past the American public. I can understand why they would be inclined to do so, given the fact that they are also pushing a \$245 billion tax cut that primarily benefits the rich.

Seniors have a right to know what is in store for Medicare and Medicaid, especially if they are being asked to bear skyrocketing premiums and limited access to quality care to help finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Working families have a right to know whether the Republicans expect them to bear even more of the costs of caring for their aging parents and grandparents so that the richest few in America can pay lower taxes.

At present, the Republican leadership appears content to continue operating in the dark, carefully avoiding the bright light of public scrutiny. I call upon them to deliver a full and open debate on how best to strengthen and improve Medicare, Medicaid, and the country's public health system. And in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to join me in performing emergency surgery on this Republican budget resolution by defeating the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for what in his point of view has to be an outstanding job of negotiation. The gentleman has worked very hard, and I have fundamental problems with this budget resolution, as I will explain, but the gentleman did an exceptional job in representing the position of the majority in the House and negotiations with the Senate. I say to the gentleman, "You took them to the cleaners, my friend, and as an observer of the process, I admire the skill with which you represented your point of view and the point of view of the majority in the House. You were exceptionally skillful."

Mr. Speaker, a budget represents much more than simply numbers on paper. It is a statement about what we stand for as a government and what we value as Americans. It is real things to real people.

At its best, it sets out our priorities, addresses our problems and helps create opportunity where none existed before.

Today, as we consider the conference agreement fashioned by our Republican colleagues, we have to look at what it stands for: Its values, its priorities, and what it means for the future of our country.

When I do that, I see a budget that fails the test of fairness, and I see a document that slams the door of opportunity in the face of millions of working Americans.

Mr. Speaker and Members, when I look at this budget, the rich get richer. Millions of struggling working Americans and poor folks will simply find that the struggle gets more difficult.

It also affects communities. Those communities in our country that are in declining urban areas or in poorer rural

areas with declining population and economic base will find it much more difficult to reverse that decline.

This budget will escalate what has become a central problem in our economy and our society: the expanding income gap between the richest and poorest Americans.

In the last 20 years, the rich have gotten richer, while most working families have seen their incomes stagnate or decline. This budget will intensify that trend and all the problems it brings to our society.

This conference agreement expresses the wrong priorities for our country. When it cuts health care by \$450 billion and Medicare and Medicaid for the poorest, most vulnerable in our society to pay for billions in new tax breaks for the most affluent, the massive tax breaks for the affluent will also force draconian cuts in needed Federal spending.

□ 1400

The \$189 billion in cuts from nondefense discretionary programs, will seriously erode national support for transportation, housing, communication, education and training, basic science, community development, energy, and the environment. At a time when the world economy is becoming more competitive, this budget abandons the traditional Federal commitment to help American businesses, farmers, and citizens to compete around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the last time we tried to balance the budget by starting with a big tax cut was in 1981, and we are still suffering from the disastrous deficits that package cost. This budget risks repeating that history all over again. It is not only unfair, it is fiscally imprudent.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the misplaced priorities and the fundamental unfairness in the Republican budget. Vote "no," my friends.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, the budget conference report we are voting on today is truly an extraordinary document that speaks well of the commitment this U.S. Congress has had of the goal of balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002 and preserving the economic health of our Nation for our next generation.

Last month I stood in this Chamber holding my granddaughter, Katy, while I cast my vote for the House's balanced budget resolution. I have kept Katy in my mind and the children of her generation as we worked to forge the budget resolution, and then worked as a member of the Budget Committee conference committee. Katy and the children of her age are why we are here doing this today, preserving the future of young Americans is our underlying goal.

Like my fellow conference committee members, I went to the conference committee committed to balanced the Federal budget and seeing the provisions of the House budget were implemented. I am proud to say that our Senate colleagues shared our commitment to a balanced budget and agreed with many of the key points of our plan. Each side in the conference was miles apart when we started on many issues, most noticeably the tax cut plan. However, these differences of opinion were not the stumbling block many critics thought they would be. We found agreement on most important issues and reached a compromise on others.

Overall, however, I believe the principles laid out in the House plan were respected by the Senate, and our priorities received the attention they needed. This conference report is a testament to the spirit of cooperation and proof of what can happen when the good of the American people is kept as the leading priority. The report is fair and it is balanced. I encourage my colleagues to support it. We are keeping our promises to the American people.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the chairman of the Committee on Science, and a 1995 academy award winner.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, I think.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first balanced budget that has been produced for real, in about 25 years, and we have actually done it. After all the years of hearing on the floor that it takes courage to balance budgets, we finally have seen a group come together that actually had the courage to produce a balanced budget, and we have proven all the naysayers wrong. We followed through on the promises that we made that this could actually be done.

In this particular budget it is balanced by the year 2002. While we do that, we provide a \$245-billion tax cut, while the Federal Government continues to grow, albeit slower than it would have grown otherwise.

I am amused when I hear the ranking member of the committee come to the floor and talk about all these rich people that are going to get the tax breaks. Yes, these are the people that the Democrats regard as rich. They are the \$50,000-a-year working family, the \$30,000-a-year working family. They are the people they regard as so rich they do not deserve a tax cut, because those are the people who benefit most from the \$500-per-child tax credit. In fact, the capital gains tax cut goes mostly to people who make working-family wages. Democrats regard them as rich; always have. That is the reason why they are always raising their taxes. We are lowering the taxes for those people.

In our budget we save Medicare. We terminate the Department of Commerce, and will continue to pursue separately from the Senate the terminations of other departments and agencies of the Government.

In the science area, where I am familiar as being speaker of the committee, I am happy to say that the conference has accepted the House position on the need for supporting basic research. The House numbers were acceded to on everything except NASA, and on NASA we did accept a number that was \$2 billion higher, because we found out that NASA has been doing double counting on the figures that the administration sent up here for us on their management plan. We did not want to do something totally unrealistic, so those numbers are adjusted.

This shows that the careful work of the House Committee on the Budget was recognized as being completely appropriate, and was a thoughtful way of reprioritizing basic research in science.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and am delighted to support the budget. Vote "yes."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, over half the cuts in the Republican tax bill go to people with incomes over \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who has done more in support of the balanced budget than any other Member of the House.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully rise in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, laying out the Federal budget for 1996.

I have had high hopes all year long about the possibility of actually voting for a balanced budget this year. I did offer and vote for one balanced budget that I believed in a month ago and, with a sense of incurable optimism, I expect to vote for a balanced budget reconciliation bill before this year is over. But this conference agreement before us is not a budget I can vote for.

First and foremost, I cannot vote for it because I am not convinced it will in fact reach balance. The deficit reduction does not even come until the third year out. The tax cuts, of course, come immediately and with the rule we passed just now, the budget doesn't even have to meet an honest CBO test as has been advertised.

Second, I cannot vote for this budget because I honestly don't understand it. The conference report tells us what outlays, revenues and the deficit will be, but it does not tell us what reductions must be made. I will use Agriculture as an example because that is the subject I know best but still I cannot understand the requirements on ag in this conference agreement.

The report instructs the Committee on Agriculture to "report changes in laws within its jurisdiction" such that outlays do not exceed \$10.5 billion in

fiscal year 1996, \$44.7 billion from fiscal year 1996-2000, and \$59.2 billion from fiscal year 1996-2002 for direct spending programs other than food stamps. Does this mean the Committee on Agriculture is to rewrite all direct spending legislation, whether it is being reduced or not? This is a tall—many would say impossible—order to accomplish before September 22.

Or, are we to infer some reduction from baseline spending—a reduction which cannot be calculated from this conference report? Or, is there a far greater reduction than the \$1 billion reduction in fiscal year 1996 and \$8.5 billion reduction over 5 years that we've been told this budget requires?

Mandatory spending other than food stamps for the Agriculture Committee totals \$26.9 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$136.4 billion through fiscal year 2002, according to Congressional Budget Office computer runs. That means this budget will force a reduction of \$16.4 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$91.7 billion over 5 years—numbers which are wildly off from the cuts stated by Republicans. I would love to have clarification from the chairman about the task my committee will have before us, as I am sure all other committees would like as well.

Third, I cannot vote for this budget because I cannot accept the level of reductions in Medicaid, Medicare, Education, and Agriculture which are required to meet the demands of the tax cut included.

And finally, I cannot vote for this budget because I believe this budget is a political statement, not realistic policy. Absolutely everyone knows that a reconciliation bill which follows the guidelines included in this budget cannot possibly be signed into law. That means we are just here playing a political game, making a political statement to be used at the polls. Reconciliation will be passed, the President will veto it, the veto will be sustained, and then everyone, having made their political statements, will finally get down to business. Why do we have to play that game? Why can't we just get down to making policy for the good of our country from the start? If it takes a budget summit, let's get one started. But for the sake of our country, let us get beyond statements and into doing the right thing.

Unfortunately, I must urge my colleagues to vote no on this budget so that we can get to work on the ultimate real budget that everyone knows must be agreed to.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for yielding the time. I would like to speak to the area of national defense for just a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 10 years, we have seen a substantial reduction in

each of the 10 years in our national defense budget. The President's budget request for fiscal year 1996 would have been the 11th year that there would have been a decline in our defense budget, at the same time that our deployments are increasing. The President just today announced another \$50 million worth of commitment to a rapid reaction force for Bosnia. I just want to tell my colleagues. That we cannot continue to do more with less.

We had hoped to make a strong turn in the direction of our national defense this year, and thanks to Speaker GINGRICH, and chairman KASICH we are going to be able to do that. We are going to make that change. During the discussion and debate with the other body and the budgeteers there, Speaker GINGRICH was very persuasive and argued strongly for keeping a strong national defense number.

But I think our colleagues need to know that the 602(b) allocation that my subcommittee had under the original budget resolution was about \$2.5 billion under what you included in the authorizing bill a few weeks ago. And we anticipate that our new 602(b) number will be, based on this conference report, will be \$2.5 billion less than that, or a total of \$5 billion less than what we voted in the authorization bill here just a few weeks ago.

The point is that a lot of things that Members would like to do and see included in the defense appropriations bill are not going to be done, because the money is just not going to be there under this budget resolution.

I am going to vote for it, because it does make the change in the direction. So this will not be an 11th year decline.

But Members need to be aware, there is just not going to be as much defense money out there to spend as many of our colleagues believe that there will be.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I compliment the gentleman and the Speaker for the good job they have done in helping to hold the defense number in conference as well as they did.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, today we will consider the short-sighted conference report on the 1996 federal budget resolution.

One of its many misjudgments is its failure to invest in the census and related statistics-gathering programs.

Yesterday, the Appropriations Committee cut the budget request for the Census Bureau by almost 25 percent—a cut that would severely damage the chance for an accurate census in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, in the realm of statistics, what you measure is what you get. By failing to provide adequate funding for the census, this budget resolution ensures that we will get an

inaccurate portrait of our Nation in the year 2000. Those inaccuracies will affect the many national decisions that are based on census data—from deciding where to build roads, schools, and hospitals, to deciding how to shape the very districts we represent, an issue of particular currency in light of this morning's Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Speaker, 1996 will be a pivotal year for the Census Bureau, as it moves from the planning stage into the operational mode for the 2000 enumeration. In 1996, the Census Bureau must design the next census, and procure the new technologies to carry it out. Moreover, in 1996, the Census Bureau must evaluate the data gathered this year from three test Census sites around the country, where the Bureau has conducted surveys that will help refine the census process for the nationwide enumeration at the turn of the century. Mr. Speaker, this under-funding of the census is just one of the many areas where the Republican budget plan would enforce misguided priorities. And it is just one of the many reasons that I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting "No" on this conference report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], one of the senior members of our committee, an outstanding member of the Committee on the Budget and a good friend.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we are really embarking on a crusade here today of sorts. Unfortunately, we do not know what the results are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, do senior citizens understand that that Republican budget resolution conference report means higher out-of-pocket health care costs for millions of seniors on fixed incomes? It's true; the average senior will pay between \$2,500 and \$3,500 more each year. And senior citizens' traditional rights under Medicare to choose their own doctor could also be threatened.

Do middle-class families understand what \$10 billion in cuts to the Student Loan Program could mean to their efforts to educate their sons and daughters?

The Republicans are telling the American people that Medicare is being protected by these cutbacks. But people have to wonder how this can be, when Medicare will be left with barely enough funding to keep up with inflation. There will not be enough money to keep pace with higher medical inflation; or with the cost of new, life-saving technologies; or with the growth in Medicare population numbers. And that means either benefits will be cut back, or seniors will have to pay more.

Do Americans understand where these dramatic cuts to health, education, research, and development are going? The answer is simple: The extra \$100 billion is going to subsidize Republican tax breaks for big business and the wealthy.

The American people are bound to ask themselves, "Where were the Republicans in 1993?"—when not a single one voted for the tough OBRA 1993 plan

that both protected Medicare's solvency through the end of the decade, and produced nearly one-half trillion dollars in deficit reduction?

That is why it is all the more ironic that today, the Republicans are demanding that we slash the heart out of Medicare; cut \$10 billion from the Student Loan Program; cut one-third of Federal funding for nondefense research and development; and keep the National Institutes of Health from expanding its research on women's health, breast cancer, heart disease, and prostate cancer. All this is supposed to be necessary in order to help protect our future.

Don't you believe it. Don't let the Republicans make Medicare, student loans, and other valuable investment programs into a cash cow, simply in order to fulfill their campaign promises. The American people will understand what we do here today, and they will thank us for voting "no" on this misguided budget resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1415

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I might just add, parenthetically at the outset of my remarks, the comments that were made by the chairman and ranking member about each other and about the work of this committee I think is perhaps a lesson that all of us, considering the last 24 hours in this body, might take to heart. We can have differences; we can have good philosophical discussions about those differences, but we can do it in the context of advancing the agenda for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution conference report—a historic agreement that establishes a 7-year balanced budget framework.

This conference report provides much-needed tax relief to America's families by allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned money in their pockets. It encourages economic growth by reducing Government regulation and eliminating inefficient programs. It protects and preserves Medicare—a system that will go broke in 7 years. And it puts our States and the American people—not the Federal Government—back in the driver's seat where they belong. Simply put, this agreement is more than a fiscal strategy for 1996-2002. It is a document that conveys an underlying philosophy about limiting Government's role in America's future.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans took their lead from the November elections and set out early this year to offer the American people a vision for our children's future. We asked ourselves fundamental questions about what role

the Federal Government ought to play in our lives because, clearly, it had overstepped its bounds. The result of months of review and discussions is the document before us today—which makes fundamental, systemic reforms that gets the Federal Government back to living within its means.

Make no mistake, this blueprint reflects decisions that were both sensible and painstaking. And as expected, reaction has been both supportive and critical. Critics are welcome to challenge this plan, in its scope or its detail; that is part of the needed debate. But in fairness, a principle set down by the President in 1993 ought to be followed: Those who would criticize this plan should be required to offer their own alternative—with the same level of comprehensiveness and specificity—to balance the Federal budget by 2002. That didn't occur—at least not until the process was so advanced that the President's proposal was meaningless.

If you believe in lifting the yoke of dependency fashioned by the welfare state and replacing it with an opportunity society; if you believe in restoring freedom by ending centralized bureaucratic micromanagement; if you believe in enhancing prosperity, economic growth, and take-home pay by reducing taxes, litigation, and regulation; then vote for this conference report.

The pursuit of a balanced budget is much more than a numbers game. It is a catalyst for reevaluating the Government down to its core and getting Government back to living within its means. This conference report achieves this goal. And while passage of this conference agreement is just one step in a long process, it moves us one step closer to accountability—fiscal accountability—which has evaded Congress for far too long.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution conference agreement.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], the new father in our caucus, the person who does not put Will to sleep by singing lullabies but by giving him a lecture on the budget process. And it works.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I oppose this resolution for the simple reason that it makes no progress in reducing the deficit over the next 2 years. This budget is a clear triumph of rhetoric over achievement.

The official numbers released to the press show modest deficit reduction over the next few years. However, these numbers do not include the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts contained in the budget. This understates the projected deficits by at least \$75 billion. Worse, if the CBO economic bonus never materializes, this understates the deficit by \$245 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this violates the principle of "pay as you go." Worse, it hides the true reality of the deficits in the conference report. Because after adding in tax cuts, even with the economic bonus, the Republican budget projections show that we will only reduce the deficit from \$175 billion today to \$174.2 billion 2 years from now.

At this rate of deficit reduction, the deficit will not be eliminated for 437 years. Even more disturbing is the fact that if interest rates do not fall significantly or we have a recession, the deficit will actually go up.

Words are cheap. Performance is what counts. I refer you to this chart.

Since President Clinton took office in 1992, with democratic leadership in Congress, we have reduced the deficit from \$290 billion in 1992 to \$175 billion in the current fiscal year. That is a 40 percent reduction. Under the conference report, if everything goes right, if interest rates fall dramatically, if we avoid a recession, if we make deficit cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education, all called for in the budget, we will make absolutely no progress on deficit reduction in the next 2 years.

This Congress will be able to go home, having cut taxes but not cut the deficit. I urge a no vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996.

I oppose this resolution for the simple reason that it does not make progress in reducing the deficit over the next 2 to 3 years. The budget we will be voting on today is a clear triumph of rhetoric over achievement, and it has been presented in a way that is nothing more than blue smoke and mirrors.

Let me explain why. The official numbers released to the press show modest deficit reduction over the next few years. However, these numbers do not include the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts that are contained in the budget.

Let me repeat; that the numbers being presented on the floor of the House today deliberately omit the effect of the \$245 billion in tax cuts called for in the resolution. This understates the projected deficits by at least \$75 billion. Worse, if the CBO economic bonus never materializes, this understates the deficit by \$245 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this violates the principle of pay-as-you-go. Worse, it masks the true reality of the deficits in the conference report. Because, after adding in tax cuts, even with economic bonus, the Republican budget projections show that we will only reduce the deficit from \$175 billion today to \$174.2 billion 2 years from now, a reduction of a mere \$800 million over the next 2 years.

At this rate of deficit reduction, the deficit will not be eliminated for 437 years. Even more disturbing is the fact that if interest rates do not fall significantly or if a recession occurs, the deficit will actually go up over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, words are cheap, performance is what counts. I call your attention to the following chart. Since President Clinton took over in 1992, while the Democrats were in power, we have reduced the Federal deficit from

\$290.4 billion in fiscal year 1992 to a projected deficit of \$175 billion in the current fiscal year. This is a reduction of 40 percent.

Now let's look at the conference report. If everything goes right—if interest rates fall dramatically, if we avoid a recession, if we make the significant cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education called for in the budget—we will make absolutely no progress on deficit reduction in the next 2 years. And, if there is the slightest blip in the economy, or the projections don't come true, deficits will actually increase.

Last month, I co-offered the coalition budget resolution. It is clear that the coalition budget offers a far superior approach for deficit reduction and for fair and shared sacrifice. Like the Conference report, the coalition budget projects a balance by 2002. However the coalition budget cuts deficits by \$100 billion more than the conference report. It provides a true glidepath—not the cliff of deficit reduction in the conference report. And, it cuts \$35 billion from the deficit over the next 2 years, real progress compared to the running in place approach of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough of tax cuts first, followed by the mere promise of deficit reduction. The people have had enough of multiyear budgets that promise the world in the out years, but make no interim progress. Let's reject this budget and pass one with meaningful progress on deficit reduction.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference budget report.

There is a new breeze coming across this land. The tax and spend policies of the Democrats is over and the "balance the budget and reduce the burden first" policy is in place. No nation has ever taxed itself into prosperity. Who knew that better than President Kennedy, the leader of your party.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed budget delineates the boldest, most ambitious fiscal blueprint this body has seen in decades. I assure you our plan will turn our country around, propelling America into the next century, once again as the world's strongest and most prosperous nation.

My colleagues, I urge you and implore you to pass this budget. If you look at this chart, you will see there is indeed a path, not 432 years, as mentioned by the opposition, the loyal opposition, but, indeed, we do balance the budget.

My colleagues, many of our Nation's governors, including Governors Whitman, Weld, Engler, and Thompson have included tax breaks as integral components of their State economic growth plan as well as President Kennedy.

There is no good reason to accept the premise, they said in a letter to the Committee on the Budget, "that current taxes are set at exactly the right level. We think taxes are too high.

It is no coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of Governor Whit-

man's state of New Jersey are among the wealthiest in the nation. We must follow through with our tax cut. Do not listen to the rhetoric that taxes are only for the rich. They benefit all Americans, all working Americans. We must decrease their burden.

In the end, we must keep our promise to America. When we do so, let us not expect the American people to thank us. For all we have done, it is really nothing more than simply returning to them what is rightfully theirs.

Mr. Speaker, the 1980's should have taught us all a very valuable lesson. The 1981 Reagan tax cut sparked the longest peacetime economic expansion in U.S. history. If there were any skeptics about the power of tax cuts to boost economic growth before the 1980's, they certainly were silenced by the Reagan revolution's sterling success. This is not mere ideological grandstanding, Mr. Chairman, this is fact. All Americans—even those in the lowest income brackets—experienced real and dramatic growth while Reagan was president.

It is unfortunate, but these lessons went unlearned by the Bush and Clinton administrations. Their capitulation to demands by Democratic-controlled Congresses that Federal spending and taxes increase produced significant economic difficulties, including a prolonged recession and income stagnation. Amazingly, under the Clinton administration, incomes decreased while the economy grew.

Tax-and-spend policies simply do not work. On the contrary, it is only by reducing taxes that we can spur economic growth and increase American wages. No nation has ever taxed itself into prosperity. Kennedy knew it, Reagan knew it, and this House knows it: tax cuts work.

Mr. Chairman, the House-passed budget delineates the boldest, most ambitious fiscal blueprint that this body has seen in decades. I assure you, our plan would turn our country around, propelling America into the next century once again as the world's strongest and most prosperous Nation. My colleagues, I urge you, I implore you: this plan and adopt the House-passed tax cuts without—I repeat, without—conditions.

The Senate plan throws the baby out with the bath water. It is premised on the notion that we have a deficit not because the Government spends too much, but because the American people are taxed too little. I couldn't disagree more. The tax burden on the American people is too high. In 1948, the average family in America paid 3 percent of its income to the Federal Government. Today that same family is forced to pay 25 percent. My colleagues, the Speaker has called tax cuts the crown jewel of the Contract With America, but they are more than the crown jewel, they are the whole tiara.

My colleagues, we must understand that tax cuts and deficit reduction are not an either/or proposition. We can do both, and we should do both. Despite the protests of those who embrace a static view of the economy, tax cuts will not only spur the economy forward, they will yield the Treasury additional revenue as well. Many of our Nation's governors, including Governors Whitman, Weld, Engler, and Thompson, have included tax breaks as integral components of their State economic-growth plans. As they wrote in a recent letter

to Congress, "There is no good reason to accept the premise that current taxes are set at exactly the right level. We think \* \* \* taxes are too high." It is no coincidence, Mr. Chairman, that the citizens of Governor Whitman's State of New Jersey are among the wealthiest in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues have argued eloquently today that now is not the time for tax cuts, that we cannot afford them. My colleagues, the fact is we cannot afford not to cut taxes. Now is no time for cold feet. We must follow through with our tax cuts. We must decrease the tax burden on families. We must keep our promise to the American people. And when we do so, let us not expect the people to thank us, for we will have done nothing great; we will have simply returned to them what is rightfully theirs.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from my native State of North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the budget represented in the conference report.

There were several ways this Congress could have reached a balanced budget, including a proposal I supported in the House, one introduced by Senator CONRAD in the Senate and the one advanced by President Clinton. Unfortunately, Speaker GINGRICH has put before us the version that gives tax breaks to America's most privileged while socking it to the middle class with deep reductions in the Medicare Program, cuts in student loans and many, many other vital areas.

I doubt there are hard-working middle-class families anywhere in this country that will take it harder than those I represent, those working very hard on family farms across North Dakota.

Under this plan, funding for agriculture is dangerously, recklessly slashed. According to an analysis of their proposal by North Dakota State University, it projects land values falling 50 percent as farmers can no longer make an adequate income in light of the sharp reductions. Farmers that have farmed their land for generations will be forced off their lands, not just in North Dakota but across rural America.

It is not just farmers either that are taking these vicious hits. It is the very warp and fabric of rural America. The Medicare cuts will close rural hospitals. The Medicaid cuts will close nursing homes. Rural development assistance, so vital to diversifying our economies, also due to be slashed.

One Republican suburban Member of this body revealed the thinking of the majority as they hit rural America so completely. He says, and I quote:

Not everyone needs to be connected to the U.S. Postal Service. If it is too expensive to deliver to some spot in North Dakota, then those residents can do without it.

This budget will take away farms. This budget will take away rural hospitals. This budget will wipe out critical services in rural America, some even advocate eliminating postal service.

Rural America has been sold out. It is a bad budget for our country.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], a freshman Member.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I was hesitant at first to support this budget resolution. While I stand among revolutionaries, I did not think this was revolutionary enough. The people on November 8 wanted us to change the way Government was running. They wanted us to downsize Government and give Government back to the people.

I am heading up a task force of great Americans that is trying to abolish the Department of Energy because, according to Vice President GORE, it is 40 percent inefficient. Over the next 30 years it is going to cost us \$70 billion unless we do something with it. I did not see it initially in this budget resolution. But after looking through the details, I found out that this is a very good plan, and it is in the details. The Senate is not as excited about it yet, but there is room to work with these details.

This starts the process of giving Government back to the people. I think that is what people want here in America. That is what they said on November 8. It balances the budget in 7 years.

It returns hope to World War II generations, my father. It returns hope to me, the babyboomer generation. And it returns hope to generation X, my children, so that we do not pass the burden on to them.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], one of the very able new Members of our committee who represents her state of California in distinguished fashion.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, once again with this conference report the House is being asked to vote yes or no on the following question: Should we take child nutrition away from our kids, college aid away from our students and their families, and health care away from seniors so that the wealthy special interests can get a tax giveaway? And once again, I expect that Members of the Republican majority will answer with a resounding yes.

Despite public opposition, they probably have the votes to pass this conference report and continue their assault on America's children, seniors, and middle income families. But let me promise the authors of this reckless budget, on behalf of the millions of Americans who will be hurt by it, we will be back.

This vote is just one step in the budget process, Mr. Speaker. We have a long summer ahead of us. The final details will not be settled until the fall. But every day families are learning that this budget takes food away from their children. Every day college students are organizing, and they will keep fighting until the Republican majority

realizes the insanity involved in shutting the classroom door on college kids in order to open up tax loopholes for large profitable corporations. We all know that America's seniors will not sit quietly this summer while Republicans take away their health security.

We have a long way to go before this reckless budget becomes a reality, Mr. Speaker. I promise you that we will be back.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report, a report that takes away from children, seniors, and middle income families to give tax breaks to the wealthiest.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of the Committee on the Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, last fall we promised the American people we would reduce the size of government, zero out the deficit and provide tax relief. And today we are keeping that promise. While this joint budget agreement does not go as far as some of us may have liked, I believe this agreement is a major victory. This budget puts us on a path to a zero budget by the year 2002 and begins to move people from welfare to work, saving \$100 billion. We have cut discretionary spending by \$190 billion, and we have already started to cut back foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, this budget provides \$245 billion in tax relief, including a \$500-per-child tax credit, tax relief for our seniors and incentives for economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children and our grandchildren, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this balanced budget.

□ 1430

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. This bill is ill-advised and should be defeated.

I strongly support balancing the Federal budget. Earlier this year I voted for the Orton-Stenholm balanced budget, which reduced Federal spending in an equitable and responsible manner. There is a right way and wrong way to balance the budget and this budget before us is the wrong way.

This agreement assumes a tax cut of \$245 billion over 7 years. It is wrong to cut benefits for seniors, low-income families, veterans, college students, NASA, and medical research to pay for a tax cut that will benefit the wealthiest in our society.

All Americans are willing to sacrifice to balance the budget, but this is not a fair budget. This budget agreement will hurt Texas, and I cannot support it.

The budget agreement will cut \$270 billion in Medicare over 7 years. The agreement will cut Medicaid by \$182 billion over 7 years.

Senior citizens under Medicare will pay more for the same benefits. Seniors will pay higher deductibles, copayments, and premiums. Additionally, senior citizens who rely on Medicaid for long-term care in nursing homes will see their benefits cut and fewer families will receive this necessary care.

These cuts in Medicare will also affect teaching hospitals and providers. Reductions in Medicare will cut \$2.4 billion in lower reimbursements for indirect medical education and direct medical education. The University of Texas system has estimated it will lose funding of \$21 million. These teaching facilities, which I represent, cannot replace these dollars. Private insurers are not willing to pay for this medical education which we benefit from.

These cuts in Medicaid will reduce reimbursements funding for 13 of Houston's hospitals by \$1.16 billion. Estimates of these cuts are a reduction of \$196 million for Harris County Hospital District, \$163 million cut from Texas Children's Hospital, \$141 million cut from Hermann Hospital, \$31 million cut from M.D. Anderson Hospital, \$17 million cut from St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, and \$17 million cut from Methodist Hospital.

The budget agreement will reduce spending for NASA, a major employer for the Houston area which I represent. NASA recently experienced cuts of 3,200 personnel at the Johnson Space Center. Under this budget, NASA will receive \$700 million less next year to build the space station and continue important scientific research. In future years, the cuts for NASA are even higher. Administrator Dan Goldin has told me that NASA cannot absorb these cuts without massive personnel cuts, and will have to eliminate centers and programs to meet these targets.

This budget agreement assumes that college students should start paying interest on their student loans before they attend a class, or buy a book. This is short sighted and wrong. An average student will pay \$5000 more for their education. Many middle-class families cannot afford these increased costs. It makes no sense to argue that this budget resolution will increase investment through tax breaks for the wealthy while cutting student loans and education programs which invest in the future of our people, the most vital ingredient of our Nation's economy.

This budget agreement will reduce funding for medical research. The agreement cuts \$100 million next year and even more in the following years from the National Institutes of Health. Medical research centers such as the Texas Medical Center cannot sustain these cuts. Valuable research projects will be stopped and new investments in cures for dreaded diseases such as cancer and AIDS will not be made.

Finally, I am concerned that this budget agreement will not reduce our Federal deficit quickly. The conference report cuts the deficit by \$800 million over 2 years. In order to balance the budget, we need to reduce spending by \$1 trillion over 7 years. \$800 million is not a good down-payment on paying down our debt. The Orton-Stenholm balanced budget will result in \$100 billion lower cumulative deficits than the conference report. Let me repeat that, \$100 billion less in debt. The Orton-Stenholm budget also cuts \$100 billion less in Medicare than the conference report, and \$43 billion less in Medicaid.

The conference report delays making the tough choices, which Congress must act upon. The Republican budget does not cut programs until years 5, 6, and 7 of the budget cycle. I believe that Congress will not follow through with these difficult cuts. If we enact tax cuts, we will have fewer revenues to lower our Federal debt.

I believe that all Americans are willing to sacrifice and share in the burden to balance the budget. However, this agreement failed to fairly distribute these cuts. It trades severe cuts in Medicare, veterans, and students for tax cuts for the wealthy and continues to expand our debt. That is wrong, and I urge the defeat of this budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD], a very thoughtful, hard-working new member of our committee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Republican conference report that pays for a \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, by slashing services and incentives for the elderly, the young, and the working poor.

Our Nation's greatness is not measured by improving the living standards of just the wealthy but of all Americans. This budget cuts investments in health care, child nutrition, and work incentives.

First, Medicaid that mainly serves poor seniors, disabled, and children, is capped at 4 percent. This is simply insufficient to offset the rapid growth of the needy and rising health care costs.

Second, it cuts nutrition programs in a way that threatens the health of children and, eventually, the health of our economy. Hungry children cannot learn and grow into productive working adults.

Third, proposed cuts in the earned income tax credit [EITC] will weaken an important incentive for people to work. President Reagan called the EITC "the best job-creation measure to come out of Congress."

These misguided cuts to benefit the wealthy are indefensible. I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget conference agreement.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Washington, Ms. JENNIFER DUNN.

Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, today we take a historic step in reducing the size of the Federal Government, providing families and employers with badly needed tax relief and erasing the Federal budget deficit. Today we are outlining a path to the future that restores both hope and opportunity for future generations.

We are dramatically changing the fiscal direction of our country. From a path of out-of-control growth of Government to a path of sustained expansion of the economy and job creation. Achieving a balanced budget will produce lower interest rates, higher productivity, improved purchasing power for all Americans, more exports and accelerated long-term growth. That will revive the American Dream.

In addition to reducing Government spending and eliminating the deficit, we are providing incentives for growth of our economy. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the Clinton administration imposed the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, placed squarely on the backs of the American people. Those tax increases took real money out of the pockets of real American families. Recent estimates suggest that with a balanced budget, our GDP would rise by an extra 2.5 percent over the next decade. This translates into an extra \$1,000 a year for every American family household.

This budget resolution unlocks the door to a prosperous, deficit-free future. Real incomes will grow faster, long-term interest rates will fall significantly, and Americans can once again look forward to their children doing better than they. With my two sons in mind as well as the generation that will follow them, I am proud to support this balanced budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], an enthusiastic, hard-working new member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, just a word about the tax-and-spend Republican budget resolution. Yes, tax and spend. That is a term we hear so much thrown against this side, but this is a tax-and-spend budget resolution for many Americans. It has been interesting, in listening through the course of this debate, not to have heard one word from our Republican colleagues about the 14 million American families that the Treasury Department estimates will have their taxes not cut but increased through what is being proposed in this budget resolution, about the earned income tax credit, the earned income tax credit, something that no less a revolutionary than Ronald Reagan described as the best jobs program ever devised by man. That program they propose to give a good whack to.

I have been concerned about the impact of raising, not lowering taxes, for people like the Kierklewski family, that are struggling to get up the economic ladder, that are struggling to reach retirement. Of course, there are some who will benefit from their version of eliminating tax and spend. The large corporations that will not have to pay a nickel with their elimination of the minimum tax credit, they are getting a tax break, but not the Kierklewski family.

What about the spend part of their resolution? Yes, they are cutting some Government spending, but they are going to spend a little more of Mr. Kierklewski's money. If he wants to go to his own doctor, he is going to have to pay maybe \$20 a month more just for the opportunity to do that, as a Medicare recipient. If he wants home health care, they are going to spend more of

his money if he wants to get the same level of service.

What is so unfortunate about that for retirees, Mr. Speaker, is that they are already having to pay 21 percent of their health care costs. One out of every \$5 already being spent by Medicare recipients is their money, so the tax-and-spend budget resolution needs to be rejected, even if we have to stay here all of another night to fight this stacking of the committees that will implement this resolution.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee and thank the chairman for their great work. We have been on track from the very start, right through the conference committee. That was that we have a balanced budget by 2002.

We have kept our word. We have dealt with real numbers. We have said, "Okay, we can create a good balance in this particular budget proposal by saying we need tax cuts. If we keep more of the revenue at home we can create more opportunity by cutting spending, so people lean more on their own shoulders instead of having to lean on the shoulders of government."

I really, honestly believe this is an opportunity budget. We are creating more opportunity and more freedoms for Americans. Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony in committee that said that the one thing we could do to really create confidence in America would be to balance our budget. It was Alan Greenspan who said that. We are doing that. We are putting us on track to restore confidence in this country, and to make people more responsible for their own lives.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the conference report on the budget, because I want to balance the budget and I want to be fair. Although the language in the conference report is an improvement over the House budget resolution, it still contains a fatal flaw, \$245 billion in tax cuts which will delay the benefit our constituents will get from deficit reduction.

As someone who voted for both rescission bills this year, I do not believe that tax cuts are warranted until we have implemented tough spending decisions. Taxes today, and we should remember this, take out of the economy less than they did 25 years ago. When Richard Nixon was President in 1970,

Federal taxes consumed 19.6 percent of the gross domestic product. Today the percentage is smaller, 19.2 percent.

What is more, the Republican plan backloads deficit reduction until after the year 2000, but gives away an easy tax cut immediately. The tax cut increases the deficit in 1997, and hopes to pay for deficit reduction in the final 2 years.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished young gentleman from the Empire State, New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know everyone is very tired after being in for over 30 hours, but it is important to straighten out certain misconceptions that have been laid out on the floor so far by some of my friends. For example, there has been some criticism, some implicit criticism that somehow the numbers do not add up for the Republican budget.

Let me tell the Members, those numbers do not come from Republican staffers, they come from the Congressional Budget Office, the same Congressional Budget Office that President Clinton in this room lectured Republican Members about the accuracy, how important that was and how accurate those numbers are. These are numbers that come from the Congressional Budget Office. They verify that we get to a balanced budget by 2002.

There are some people who have talked about cutting student aid and cutting student loans. There are no cuts in any student aid package in this budget. There has been some suggestion somehow that tax cuts go to the wealthy. Eighty-seven and a half percent of the child tax credits for young working families are going to go to families making under \$75,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a positive budget for the average people of America. Economists agree that a balanced budget will lower interest rates, increase investment, allow for a higher standard of living for our children and grandchildren. According to Alan Greenspan, who testified before our committee, productivity would accelerate, the inflation rate would be subdued, financial markets would be more solid, and the underlying outlook would be generally improved for underlying economic growth if this budget is balanced. Is that something we could not all agree on as an objective? Real incomes would improve, taxes would fall, and Americans will be able to look forward to their children doing better than they. What better promise can we deliver for our children?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the conference agreement on House Concurrent Resolution 67, which steers us on a true course toward a balanced budget in 2002. This historic budget resolution accomplishes many goals, but one of the most important is that it demonstrates our strong commitment to keeping the promises we made to the American people.

We promised to balance the budget, and this is the crucial first step in that process. It

is a tough, but fair and forward-thinking plan. Every part of the country—urban and rural—is impacted.

This budget achieves a zero deficit by 2002 without touching Social Security, while at the same time cutting taxes for America's hard-working families, and preserving, protecting, and strengthening the Medicare program.

Although President Clinton's second budget proposal fails to reach balance, at least he finally agrees with Congress and the American people that the budget needs to be balanced, middle-class families need tax relief, and that the Medicare and Medicaid programs need to be strengthened in order to preserve their existence.

A balanced budget is the surest strategy to increase productivity and living standards by increasing national savings in America.

Although this is an important landmark, we must remember that our work has only just begun. Only when the budget is totally balanced will we have completely fulfilled our mandate and protected the future of our children.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago this body faced a difficult task when the American savings and loan industry had to be rescued. Leaders in Congress and elsewhere ignored warnings that something was wrong and continued business as usual, recognizing the crisis only after it had happened. The result was a disaster that cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to say it is happening again. We are facing a crisis that is even more inevitable than what we faced with the savings and loans: HUD's portfolio of insured section 8 project-based properties.

The tale of how we got where we are is a classic example of the law of unintended consequences. Few in 1974, when the authorizing legislation was passed, could have foreseen what would happen to the real estate market in the 1980's, nor could they reliably predict other elements in the market.

What the Congress created in 1974 was meant to provide affordable housing to needy Americans. It has become, however, a financial time bomb that is about to explode with tens of billions of dollars in consequences.

The problem with the combination of section 8 subsidies and FHA multifamily mortgage insurance is that it places the Government on both ends of the deal. It's a catch-22: we have to lower the inflated subsidies to market rates in order to achieve savings, but if we lower the subsidies thoughtlessly we risk defaults that could cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars.

When the House Budget Committee, of which I am a member, met this spring to discuss budget options, I raised the section 8 contract renewal issue. It is a problem without an easy solution and, try as we did, there is no way to show short-term savings.

I supported resolving the situation created by section 8 and FHA multifamily insurance by returning the properties to market discipline because it is the least objectionable of the choices we face. I am glad to say that my colleagues on the House Budget Committee realized the gravity of the situation and were willing to address the crisis honestly. We may not like it, but it may well be our only alternative.

But we cannot be swayed from addressing this situation honestly. We need to resolve this problem now because if we don't mark these

properties to market, we are only holding off the inevitable for a few years at best. It could also mean we would risk consequences far more severe than purely financial—we risk the displacement of hundreds of thousands of families.

We should realize that nearly half of these units house elderly or disabled people. Throwing these people out on the street for short-term budgetary gain is not an acceptable option.

I am disappointed in the other body for their support of the status quo throughout the budget conference. Simply renewing the contracts may temporarily hold off the flood, but what we are really doing is nothing more than putting our finger in the dike and ignoring the fact that, finger or no finger, the seawall is crumbling around us.

We had hoped to address this issue in the reconciliation process because of the pay-go rules. As it is, we cannot avoid a mandatory expense because cutting subsidies will mean claims against the FHA fund. There is no way around that.

We have to be honest and realize that the solution, in the short term, may be more expensive than the status quo. But not resolving this quickly will mean we are only continuing along a path of short-sighted quick-fixes that fail us in the long run.

The current system is bad for tenants, bad for the markets, and is downright irresponsible to the taxpayers of this country.

When American voters spoke last November, they asked us to be honest and make tough choices. The time has come to make good on our promise to do just that. As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, I intend to make sure that happens in a balanced, fair manner.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I, like everyone else in this Congress, have a family, and I think we all do our utmost to make sure that, as we balance our family budgets, as we must do at the end of every year, we have planned for our future, not just for our present.

I must tell the Members, when I take a look at what is before us today in terms of a budget for the family of America, I do not see this comporting to what the needs are for all the families of America. In my family, as my parents did, our parents did, I plan for the two children that I have right now to go on to college. I prepare for the illnesses that my spouse, my wife or my kids may face. We must plan for that day when it rains a little bit more than we expect, and we need that extra cash.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see this in this budget. What I do see is \$245 billion in tax breaks, mostly going to people who are wealthy in this country. I do see cuts of \$10 billion, yes, \$10 billion in cuts for education, for college, and I see \$270 billion in cuts for Medicare, for our elderly, and \$180 billion in Medicaid for our elderly and our poor.

That is not planning the way my parents would do it, the way my family

would do it, not any family in America would do it. I urge the Members to reject this budget proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland, OH [Mr. HOKE], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, maybe it is that we have been up all night, but this debate has been kind of snoozy. The fact is that we are doing something that is so extraordinary and so unusual. There are some of us who are a little upset about it, because 7 years is a long time. If this was the private sector, if this was business, and we had to downsize over a 7-year period to get our books in order, we would be out of business. We would be kaput.

It is government, so we are going to drag our heels a little bit and take time, but we are doing it. We are doing it. It is the first time in 25 years. It is phenomenal. It is incredible. I admit, we have all been up all night long, 38 hours, 36 hours, whatever. The fact is we are going to have a balanced budget for the United States of America, for our children, for our grandchildren. We are actually recapitulating what we done over 200 years ago, no taxation without representation. Let us celebrate it.

For heaven's sakes, please, if Members honestly believe that this somehow drags money out of the mouths of babes and the elderly, they have always got to see the glass as being completely half empty.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. What we are facing here is class warfare, and the warfare is on the middle class, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. On page 74 of the conference report, it talks about \$10 billion in outlays over the next 7 years being reduced from the student loan program, a 20-percent cut in job training funds, \$270 billion cut out of Medicare, so what are we doing here? We are going to cut taxes for the top 1 percent, your mother and father are going to lose Medicare benefits, your kids are not going to be able to get a student loan, and when you lose your job and try to get job training funds, they are going to be gone, too.

□ 1445

So what are we doing here? It is very simple. This is a war on the middle class so that we can get a tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent again. It is just what they did in the early 1980's. It ballooned the deficit. It did not balance it. And it hurts the country.

People who work for a living have a right to expect that their parents will get decent medical care, that their kids can go to college, and that they can get retrained.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is about time. This budget resolution reduces the annual deficit over 7 years and reaches a balanced budget in 2002, without attempting a tax increase. Indeed, it contemplates a cumulative tax reduction of approximately \$245 billion over the 7 years of the budget as a partial offset to the huge tax increase of 2 years ago. This is a very positive step and signifies a turning of the ship of state from what Hayek called the Road to Serfdom in his classic 1945 work of government overspending. But, in another sense, it showcases the growth of our Federal Government over the last 25 years. This budget calls for total outlays of \$1.587 trillion in 1996, and is seen as a bare bones budget. To put this in perspective, total Federal outlays did not reach \$100 billion until 1962. It then only took a little more than a quarter of a century to reach \$1 trillion. Seventeen years later, we have a situation where net interest on the national debt exceeds the entire Federal budget of 1974.

The passage of this budget resolution is a signal that the new Congress has recognized the effects of our huge Federal debt, yet, by the time the debt stops growing in 2002, the debt will have grown to \$6.7 trillion. While this budget accomplishes a great deal, there is a great deal more to be done. As we move forward we should keep in mind the words of Dr. DICK ARMEY, in his book he wrote in the 20th century "The Freedom Revolution": "The people themselves, not their government, should be trusted with spending their own money and making their own decisions."

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I along with a lot of my colleagues very much want to support a responsible, reasonable and balanced plan to balance the budget. While there are many positive aspects of this budget, and it represents a clear improvement over the budget that was initially passed by the House, I have concluded that the conference report still falls far short of its goal.

Under this conference report, 2 years from now the budget deficit will be the same as it is today. More importantly, this budget takes credit for \$170 billion of economic bonus whether or not CBO concludes that it deserves the credit.

While I agree that we need to reform Medicare and Medicaid, I have not been convinced that we can achieve savings in these programs of the magnitude required in this budget without doing harm to our health care system. I also have serious concerns about the cuts in agricultural programs in this budget. Cuts of this magnitude will unilaterally disarm American agriculture in the battle of the global economy.

Finally, I do not understand why the conferees continued to insist on savings in education programs. If there is one place we agree, it is that we need to have an opportunity for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I rise in opposition to this conference report. I strongly support the goal of balancing the budget by 2002 and am committed to finding a bipartisan solution to our deficit problem. I very much want to support a reasonable, balanced, and responsible plan to balance the budget. While there are many positive aspects of this budget and it represents a clear improvement over the budget initially passed by the House, I have concluded that this conference report still falls short of this goal.

This budget falls well short of the goal of putting the budget on a responsible path toward balance. The conference report backloads the deficit reduction in the last 2 years. In fact, under this conference report, 2 years from now the budget deficit will be the same as it is today. Although the conferees initially reported that tax cuts would be postponed until CBO has certified that we have produced sufficient spending cuts to balance the budget, the conference report before us now does not include this provision. The Ways and Means Committee will not need to wait until CBO certifies that we have put the budget on a credible glide path toward balance before enacting tax cuts. More importantly, this budget takes credit for the \$170 billion economic bonus whether or not CBO concludes that we deserve credit.

I agree that it is imperative that the budget control the growth of Medicare and Medicaid by reforming these programs to reduce their rapid growth. However, I have not been convinced that we can achieve savings in the Medicare and Medicaid programs of the magnitude required in this budget without doing harm to our health care system and shifting costs to States and local governments and the private sector. I am particularly concerned about the impact that Medicare and Medicaid could have on critical rural hospitals.

I also have serious concerns about the cuts in agricultural programs in this budget. Once again, agriculture is being asked to bear more than its fair share of cuts. Cuts of this magnitude will unilaterally disarm American farmers in the battle in the global economy.

Finally, I do not understand why the conferees continued to insist on savings in education programs. If there is one priority in the budget that everyone should be able to agree on, it is that we should help younger generations receive the education they need to provide for a strong future for this Nation. The education cuts, particularly in student loans, will make it much more difficult for students to help themselves by receiving an education.

The budget alternative offered by the coalition earlier this year met the goal of balancing the budget by 2002 through responsible reforms of government programs while avoiding the ill-advised cuts in agriculture, Medicare, Medicaid, and education programs in this conference report. I continue to believe that the coalition budget represents the reasonable middle ground that can be the basis for a consensus on this issue. I intend to work with the President and the leadership of Congress in a

constructive manner to put together a plan to balance the budget that can receive strong support within Congress and among the American public and which can be enacted into law.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, one of America's real war heroes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe people are talking about not giving money back to the people of America. It is your money. We need to give it back to you. It is not Government's money.

Mr. Speaker, today Republicans will pass the first plan in 26 years that balances the Federal budget. This budget ensures a secure future for this country and protects the children of tomorrow by eliminating the debt of today.

This budget is proof that Republicans, unlike the President, are serious about eliminating the deficit, downsizing the Government, and giving much needed tax relief to all Americans. This budget is fair, it is balanced and it is the right thing to do.

I consider this one of the most important votes we will ever make in the Congress. We hold America's future in our hands. This is the greatest Nation on Earth and this budget will ensure that it will have the financial security to stay that way.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for prosperity, vote for our future, and to vote for our children. Vote "yes" on this budget, our country deserves it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the distinguished senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, Speaker GINGRICH, and also Senator GRAMM. I do not think in our lifetime or perhaps in history have they gone out of their way to show you the difference between the Democrat and the Republican. I think that is important.

As I understand the argument, if you are sick, if you are poor, if you are blind or disabled, that is not a Federal problem and it entitles you to absolutely nothing. The fact is, as the Speaker said before, it is time to give the tax money back to those people that earn it. The fact that rich people earn it means you give it back to rich people. Therefore, the poor should rely more on charitable organizations, not-for-profit organizations, even though I understand the Republicans want a flat tax that would even withdraw the incentives to make contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that what is going on now is revolutionary. The Supreme Court has said that you cannot elect people based on their color. We are going after affirmative action and now we are going after the rest of the poor. Congratulations, you have made history.

Mr. Speaker, the way I look at it, while it is so easy to identify the poor among us sometimes, when people real-

ly see that we are making these cuts in order to return this money to the rich, that ultimately the poor, the sick, and the aged are not going to go away.

True, when you give a block grant, you say that we do not have any responsibility; let the Governors do it. After all, they are closer to the problem. The Governors will say let the mayors do it, and the mayors will say let the churches and the synagogues and the temples do it.

Even when someone comes back and they say they want to change, the Democrats didn't do the right thing, they never meant that we would just take our responsibility and throw it back to the communities that cannot afford to raise the taxes to do what has to be done.

I do hope when the American people finally wake up and see exactly what we are doing to them, it is clearly supporting tax breaks for those whom God has blessed with the riches among us, and going after programs and saying it is not a Federal entitlement, leave it up to the charitable organizations.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentleman, the chairman, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in proud support of the conference committee report. As one of the 72 new Republicans who were elected in November, no group stands more solidly behind change here in Congress. Indeed, as the distinguished gentleman from New York has pointed out, there is a difference between Republicans and Democrats.

We believe in thoughtful spending. We do not believe in funding it and forgetting it. We believe in fiscal sanity. We believe in a balanced budget, and we believe that the American people sent a clear message to Congress that they want change. That is what we represent here in Congress.

I urge adoption of the committee conference report.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] pointed out earlier, that the debate is a little bit stale. I think it is stale because the folks on the other side are missing two points.

No. 1, they are missing the point that the American people do not believe that they are out to save the middle class. They realize that they define redistribution in such a way that everybody is wealthy in their book.

The second reason is I think the American people realize it is time for us to do something. That is what we are doing on this side, and it is very exciting to be part of this historic effort to balance the budget over 7 years.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Cincinnati, OH [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I want to commend him and his bipartisan team that put together this budget. They have done a great job. Let us not forget, as someone has mentioned, we have not had a balanced budget around here since 1969, so this is historic.

Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on the Budget revealed to me that in his first budget he wrote, which was in about 1969 in the Ohio State Senate, he got one vote. It was his own. Today he is probably going to get about 250 times that amount. He gets the most improved award, I guess.

The reason he is going to get that kind of support is because this document is fair. Despite what my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means from New York said, it is fair. It is fair in that everything is on the table. It is fair in that everybody makes a sacrifice for the future of the country and, yes, it is fair because it is fair to the next generation of Americans who otherwise would be burdened with skyrocketing taxes and a failing economy because of our irresponsible and reckless spending.

Our real challenge is going to be to keep our resolve 2 years from now, 4 years from now, 6 years from now. I think we will do it but we need the momentum today to be able to do it. It is not going to be easy but nothing is more important.

I urge everyone to support this document because it is fair, it is a great start, and again I want to commend the bipartisan team.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, for 13 years I served in the State House and I watched Congress deficit-spend, and I wondered if I would ever have the chance to be part of a movement in Congress to get our financial house in order.

When I was first elected, I noticed this young man named JOHN KASICH, who was coming in with these budgets to balance, to get our financial house in order, and only about 30 people were supporting him. He kept working at it and we are at this day today, which is very historic.

I have waited 20 years and I have worked for 20 years to finally be able to vote for a budget that is balanced. The challenge we have is when I listen to my colleagues and they say we are not taking care of the sick or poor, they simply are distorting the issue when they say we are cutting Medicare or Medicaid.

The fact is with Medicaid we are going to go from \$89 billion to \$124 billion. Only in Washington when you spend more do people call it a cut. We

are going to spend \$329 billion more in the next 7 years on Medicaid.

Then we have the challenge of Medicare. Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years. The White House, Congress, the minority party wanted to ignore it. We weighed in and said we need to slow the growth of Medicare. We are going to slow the growth, but it is still going to go from \$178 billion to \$274 billion. Only in Washington when you spend more money do people call it a cut.

We are going to spend \$675 billion more for Medicare in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7 years. Social Security is going to go up 5.3 percent each year for the next 7 years; Medicare, an average of 6.3 percent each year for the next 7 years; Medicaid, an average of 4.9 percent each year for the next 7 years. Other entitlements are going to go up to 4.1 percent.

What we are cutting is Government. We are going to downsize Government. We are going to make it smaller. The school lunch program is going to go up. Our health care programs are going to go up, but we are going to make this Government smaller. In the process, we are going to change this caretaking society to a caring society.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], a very hard-working, enthusiastic Member.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what my colleague who just finished talking failed to realize is that none of the increases that they are talking about have anything to do with increased enrollment, whether it is students or increased enrollment of seniors in Medicare or any increase in any inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican plan to cut Medicare to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy.

Make no mistake about it, that is what this budget resolution is all about. It is not about reducing the budget deficit. It is not about fixing Medicare. It is about cutting Medicare by \$270 billion in order to pay for tax breaks for big corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

No matter how you disguise it, this budget resolution is a frontal assault on America's 37 million senior citizens—people like Julius and Dottie Ruskin in my district in West Haven, CT.

Julius and Dottie live on Social Security and his company pension for a total income of about \$14,000 a year. Julius' medical bills this year have already totaled more than \$10,000, and Medicare pays for 80 percent of these costs. Julius and Dottie simply cannot afford to pay \$3,400 more out-of-pocket for their health care over the next 7 years, but that is what the Republican cuts to Medicare will mean for the average senior. They will pay more, but they will get fewer benefits and restrictions on their choice of their own doctor.

The Republicans may be keeping their promises to the rich and power-

ful. But they are breaking our Nation's historic promise to the health and welfare of senior citizens like Julius and Dottie Ruskin.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

□ 1500

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the statement of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] who said we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid and not looking into consideration of increases. Medicare goes up from \$4,800 per beneficiary to \$6,734 per beneficiary. We are providing more per beneficiary each and every year.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], a Member who is very concerned about education.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget calls for \$100 billion in cuts in low-income assistance programs including aid to families with dependent children, food stamps, supplemental security income, child welfare programs, and the earned income tax credit.

These programs are left unscathed by the alternative budget which the CBC prepared earlier. Republicans have continually assaulted these welfare programs, as they call them, since the beginning of the Congress but have neglected to seriously attack other forms of welfare.

For example, the abuses in farm subsidy programs are widespread and well-known and they have not been attacked. Republicans also have not attacked corporate welfare. The problem of corporate welfare was at least recognized in the House-passed budget. The House did include at least \$25 billion in corporate welfare cuts when the bill left here and the Senate also enacted their version, it had \$9.4 billion in corporate welfare cuts.

But somehow in the conference all of this was dropped and there are zero cuts in corporate welfare at this point. To add insult to injury, after we vote on this budget agreement we will also have a rescissions package brought back. I urge a "no" vote on this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the conference agreement on the fiscal year budget resolution. This budget decimates virtually every major social program on which working families rely. The budget inflicts immense pain on those least able to withstand it while perpetuating corporate welfare, increasing defense spending, and cutting taxes for the wealthiest individuals.

First and foremost, the conference agreement calls for cuts for \$10 billion in outlays for student aid and a 33-percent cut in discretionary spending for education and training programs over the next 7 years. Due to

spending caps, we would lose \$4 to \$5 billion in education funding in fiscal year 1996 alone.

In stark contrast to the Republican scheme, the President, the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC], and the Progressive Caucus have made the education and job training portion of the budget their top priority—a view which is in line with the majority of the American people. Both the President's proposed budget plan and the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget include tens of billions of dollars in spending increases for education and job training, while the Republican plan proposes to cut spending on these programs by similar amounts.

Second, the Republican budget slashes Medicare by \$270 billion and Medicaid by \$182 billion. The Medicare cuts translate into \$150 month out of the pocket of the average senior citizen, and the Medicaid cuts mean that 800,000 to 1 million seniors and individuals with disabilities will lose health care coverage completely. The CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget, on the other hand, leaves these vital programs intact with no decreases in funding.

Third, the Republican budget calls for \$100 billion in cuts in low-income assistance programs, including aid to families with dependent children [AFDC], food stamps, supplemental security income [SSI], child welfare programs, and the earned income tax credit [EITC]. Again, these programs are left unscathed by the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

Republicans have continually assaulted these welfare programs since the beginning of the Congress but have neglected to seriously attack other forms of welfare. For example, the abuses in farm subsidy programs are widespread and well-known. Today, the environmental working group once again is releasing a report which details such abuses. In this report, the "Fox in the Henhouse," it is revealed that local, federally paid, Department of Agriculture employees who run farm subsidy programs routinely practice fraud, extortion, and embezzlement. In just one incident in California, four employees fraudulently issued 17 Federal farm subsidy checks worth more than \$270,000, using the cash to buy illegal drugs.

Republicans also should be ashamed to bring a budget plan to the floor which drastically reduces funding for every program for the working poor and does not strip a single cent from corporate welfare. That is right—not a single cent. The House-passed budget resolution included \$25 billion in corporate welfare cuts, and the Senate-passed version included \$9.4 billion, but somehow all of that was dropped in conference.

America's working families know that we can do better than that. The dirty little secret of corporate welfare is out of the bag. The CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget includes \$500 billion in corporate welfare cuts, so the people know that it can be done. And it is not just Democrats who are pushing for an end to corporate welfare. Even the very conservative Heritage Foundation is on board with the idea.

To add insult to injury, after we vote on this budget agreement, we will vote on the new Republican version of the rescissions package that President Clinton vetoed earlier this month. Unfortunately, the new bill is only slightly better. It is like telling the American

people that we are going to give them one cyanide pill instead of two. The rescissions bill remains completely unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to reject the budget conference agreement and the rescissions package, both of which deliver a sharp blow to the stomachs of the most vulnerable Americans without equitably distributing the pain necessary to move toward a balanced budget.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 455]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—411

Abercrombie	Combest	Gilman
Ackerman	Condit	Gonzalez
Allard	Conyers	Goodlatte
Andrews	Cooley	Goodling
Armey	Costello	Gordon
Bachus	Cox	Goss
Baesler	Cramer	Graham
Baker (CA)	Crane	Green
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Greenwood
Baldacci	Creameans	Gunderson
Ballenger	Cubin	Gutierrez
Barcia	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Barr	Danner	Hall (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Davis	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Hamilton
Bartlett	Deal	Hancock
Barton	DeFazio	Hansen
Bass	DeLauro	Harman
Bateman	DeLay	Hastert
Becerra	Dellums	Hastings (FL)
Beilenson	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bentsen	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Bereuter	Dickey	Hayworth
Berman	Dicks	Hefley
Bevill	Dingell	Hefner
Bilbray	Dixon	Heineman
Bilirakis	Doggett	Herger
Bishop	Dooley	Hilleary
Bliley	Doolittle	Hilliard
Blute	Dornan	Hinchey
Boehlert	Doyle	Hobson
Boehner	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoke
Bonior	Durbin	Holden
Bono	Edwards	Horn
Borski	Ehlers	Houghton
Boucher	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Brewster	Emerson	Hunter
Browder	Engel	Hutchinson
Brown (CA)	English	Hyde
Brown (FL)	Ensign	Inglis
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Brownback	Evans	Jacobs
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bryant (TX)	Ewing	Johnson (SD)
Bunn	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Bunning	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Fawell	Johnston
Burton	Fazio	Jones
Buyer	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Callahan	Filner	Kaptur
Calvert	Flake	Kasich
Camp	Flanagan	Kelly
Canady	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Castle	Ford	Kennelly
Chabot	Fowler	Kildee
Chambliss	Fox	Kim
Chapman	Franks (CT)	King
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)	Kingston
Christensen	Frelinghuysen	Kleczka
Chryslers	Frisa	Klink
Clay	Frost	Klug
Clayton	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Clement	Furse	Kolbe
Clinger	Galleghy	LaFalce
Clyburn	Ganske	LaHood
Coble	Gejdenson	Lantos
Coburn	Gekas	Largent
Coleman	Gephardt	Latham
Collins (GA)	Geren	LaTourette
Collins (IL)	Gilchrest	Laughlin
Collins (MI)	Gillmor	Lazio

Leach	Olver	Smith (MI)
Levin	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Smith (TX)
Lewis (GA)	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Lewis (KY)	Packard	Solomon
Lightfoot	Pallone	Souder
Lincoln	Parker	Spence
Linder	Pastor	Spratt
Lipinski	Paxon	Stearns
Livingston	Payne (NJ)	Stenholm
LoBiondo	Payne (VA)	Stockman
Lofgren	Pelosi	Stokes
Longley	Peterson (FL)	Studds
Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Stump
Lucas	Petri	Stupak
Luther	Pickett	Talent
Maloney	Pombo	Tanner
Manton	Pomeroy	Tate
Manzullo	Porter	Taylor (MS)
Markey	Portman	Taylor (NC)
Martinez	Poshard	Tejeda
Martini	Pryce	Thomas
Mascara	Quillen	Thompson
Matsui	Quinn	Thornberry
McCarthy	Radanovich	Thornton
McCrery	Rahall	Thurman
McDade	Ramstad	Tiahrt
McDermott	Rangel	Torkildsen
McHale	Reed	Torres
McHugh	Regula	Torrice
McInnis	Richardson	Towns
McIntosh	Rivers	Traficant
Cox	Roberts	Upton
McKeon	Roemer	Velazquez
McNulty	Rogers	Vento
Meehan	Meek	Rohrabacher
Menendez	Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen
Metcalf	Metcalf	Rose
Meyers	Meyers	Roth
Mfume	Mfume	Roukema
Mica	Mica	Roybal-Allard
Miller (CA)	Miller (CA)	Royce
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Rush
Mineta	Mineta	Sabo
Minge	Minge	Salmon
Mink	Mink	Sanders
Molinari	Molinari	Sanford
Mollohan	Mollohan	Sawyer
Montgomery	Montgomery	Saxton
Moorhead	Moorhead	Schaefer
Moran	Moran	Schiff
Morella	Morella	Schroeder
Murtha	Murtha	Schumer
Myers	Myers	Seastrand
Myrick	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Nadler	Nadler	Serrano
Neal	Neal	Shadegg
Nethercutt	Nethercutt	Shaw
Neumann	Neumann	Shays
Ney	Ney	Sisisky
Norwood	Norwood	Skaggs
Nussle	Nussle	Skeen
Oberstar	Oberstar	Skelton
Obey	Obey	Slaughter
		Zimmer

□ 1521

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). On this rollcall, 411 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEARS 1996-2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 5 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

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