

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 million 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
Armedy	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
Boehkert	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	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
Meek	Ros-Lehtinen	Volkmer
Menendez	Rose	Vucanovich
Metcalfe	Roth	Waldholtz
Meyers	Roukema	Walker
Mfume	Mica	Walsh
Miller (CA)	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Rush	Ward
Mineta	Sabo	Waters
Minge	Salmon	Watt (NC)
Mink	Sanders	Watts (OK)
Molinari	Sanford	Waxman
Mollohan	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Montgomery	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Moorhead	Schaefer	Weller
Moran	Schiff	White
Morella	Schroeder	Whitfield
Murtha	Schumer	Wicker
Myers	Seastrand	Williams
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Wise
Nadler	Serrano	Wolf
Neal	Shadegg	Woolsey
Nethercutt	Shaw	Wyden
Neumann	Shays	Wynn
Ney	Sisisky	Yates
Norwood	Skaggs	Young (AK)
Nussle	Skeen	Young (FL)
Oberstar	Skelton	Zeliff
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.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report and would point out that this budget resolution will inflict a brutal blow on Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution because of the cuts it imposes on our Nation's Federal employees.

The budget resolution increases the contributions that Federal employees pay into their retirement system. The Republicans have pledged to make the Federal Government work more like the private sector. But in the private sector, 97 percent of all medium and large companies fully finance their employees' pension plan. Federal employee contributions to their retirement system are among the highest in the Nation. The resolution increases those contributions.

For their increased contributions to their pension plans, Federal employees will receive less. The Congressional Research Service has already estimated that Federal pensions are less generous than comparable private sector pension. We are going to make these pensions even worse by changing the accrual formula from high three to high five. This will reduce the Federal annuity by 4 percent. Republicans talk about the need to operate the Federal retirement system like a private pension plan. But this change would be illegal in the private sector.

Finally, the Republicans are proposing draconian cuts in the operation of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. The budget resolution proposes to cap the government investment at \$1,535 for individuals and \$3,430 for families. This cap grows with inflation over the next 7 years. While this sounds reasonable, this proposal will have serious consequences for the average Federal employee and his family. As we all know, health care inflation is much higher than changes in the Consumer Price Index. As time goes by, the employees out of pocket expenses will grow. By the year 2000, the average Federal employee will be losing \$500 per year. The senior citizen on the plan will be facing even worse consequences because the Medicare cuts proposed in this resolution will force up the costs of the Federal Health Plan. Those individuals living on a fixed income will be forced to either pay a greater share of their income on health care or change to a program that does not meet their needs.

The Republicans talk about making contracts and keeping promises. But this is only talk. When it comes down to action, the Republicans are breaking their promises and violating the contracts we have with our Nation's Federal employees. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this budget resolution.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and share the views of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican's budget conference report which will have a devastating effect on my constituents and all America.

Last Monday, I held a townhall meeting on the budget cuts in Jacksonville, FL. Mr. Speaker, I had so many people show up that I had to turn busloads away. The people are very concerned about how these severe budget cuts will affect themselves, their parents, and their children.

Our seniors, who rely so heavily on Medicare and Medicaid will be especially hard hit. Medicare and Medicaid will be reduced to second-rate health care systems so the Republicans can pay for the crown jewel of the Republican Contract on America, a multibillion-dollar tax cut for the wealthy.

In my State of Florida alone, Medicare will be cut by \$29 billion by the year 2002, and Medicaid will be slashed by \$9.2 billion. By the year 2002, seniors will pay \$1,060 more in out-of-pocket expenses for second-rate Medicare.

In addition to cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, this mean-spirited budget cuts education \$10 billion. It also cuts veterans' programs by \$32 billion over the next 7 years. This is truly a case of the haves taking from the have-nots.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only let the fox guard the hen house—we have let the fox take charge.

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 and to delineate for my colleagues the specific impacts this budget resolution is likely to have on the Federal Aviation Administration.

I say, is likely to have, because the conference report does not spell out the details of the cuts proposed for the FAA budget; but, given the general numbers and spending targets set down in the budget agreement we can calculate what the effects will be on specific FAA programs, such as the agency's new zero accident goal.

As ranking member of the House Aviation Subcommittee I want all my House colleagues to understand the critical mission of the FAA. This agency manages the world's largest air traffic control system, through which move half of all the one billion passengers who travel world-wide every year by air. They operate the Air Traffic Control system 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, handling, on average, two flights every second.

On an average day, FAA safety and security professionals will conduct nearly 1,000 inspec-

tions on pilots, planes and airports, ensuring that they remain air worthy and safe.

FAA maintains over 30,000 pieces of complex safety equipment and facilities across this Nation, operating at a reliability factor of 99.4 percent—a safety record envied by the rest of the world.

FAA issues more than 1,000 airport grants annually to improve airport safety and infrastructure.

FAA conducts 355,000 inspections annually to enforce safety standards and to issue certificates and licenses for aviation products and operators. FAA takes more than 12,000 enforcement actions each year.

The FAA has taken its share of cuts in the last 2 years as its contribution toward deficit reduction: FAA has cut 5,000 employees since 1993 for a current total of 48,000 total employees. Of that number 36,000 have direct hands-on involvement in the ATC system, which includes 14 of the 15 busiest airports in the world.

In this era of deregulation with extraordinary growth in both passengers and air traffic operations, we have seen a growth of 6 percent in air traffic during the last 2 years as the airlines have recovered from the serious economic decline and \$12 billion in losses of 1990–92. But while air traffic has jumped 6 percent these last 2 years, the FAA budget has suffered a real decline of 6 percent, which translates into a \$600 million cut.

This budget resolution conference agreement chops an additional \$10 billion from transportation spending, which if spread, as expected, to the FAA will jeopardize the safety and efficiency of the Nation's aviation system.

Under this budget resolution FAA's ability to improve weather and safety equipment and prevent accidents would be compromised.

Introduction of global positioning satellite navigation technology would be delayed at least 5 years, costing airlines millions of dollars a year in lost efficiency.

The ability of the aviation security system to maintain its vigilance against domestic and international terrorism would be cut by one-third.

FAA's obligation to certify new aircraft engines and parts would be greatly compromised and might even have to be contracted out to private interests which, in my judgment, clearly is not in the best interest of safety.

The weather services to general aviation and to commercial aviation provided through the Nation's flight service stations would be greatly impaired as FSS and control towers would be closed, costing jobs and air traffic services to hundreds of communities in all 50 States, and delays to an estimated 105,000 flights annually, at an estimated costs to carriers and passengers of more than \$2.3 billion.

I am just touching the tip of the iceberg on the impact of these cuts projected out over the next several years for the FAA as a result of this budget resolution.

The dedicated professionals of the FAA deserve better. They deserve our full support for full funding out of the aviation trust fund to maintain our air traffic control system at its highest level of safety and efficiency.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this bill that devastates Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 67, the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution. This bill was terrible when it passed the House in May and it is just as awful today.

What you will hear about this budget resolution is that it balances the budget by the year 2002. Clearly, this is an important and extremely worthy goal. What you will not hear about is how it balances the budget—on the backs of senior citizens, college students, the working poor, and children with mothers and fathers on welfare. Rather than cutting the bloated defense budget, or ending corporate welfare, House Concurrent Resolution 67 attacks Medicare, guaranteed student loans, the earned income tax credit, public transportation, and lunches for school children to bear the brunt of the budget hatchet.

Today, you will also hear about how responsible this budget is. You'll hear many Members congratulating each other for addressing the budget deficit responsibly. Well, if this were true, we could all be proud of the budget before us today. Unfortunately, House Concurrent Resolution 67 is extremely irresponsible. It provides a \$245 billion tax cut to Americans who least need it at a time when we can least afford it. In order to fund this tax cut and balance the budget, House Concurrent Resolution 67 cuts critical Federal investments in the future of this country.

Let's look at exactly what this budget resolution proposes and who will be hurt by it. House Concurrent Resolution 67 cuts Medicare spending by \$270 billion over the next 7 years. Judging from the letters and calls that have been pouring into my office about Medicare funding, this is not a cut that the senior citizens in my congressional district can afford. Higher out-of-pocket costs for Medicare benefits will be devastating to many 7th Congressional District senior citizens on fixed incomes.

This budget also cuts funding for student aid by \$10 billion over the next years. How the budget cutters decided that it is responsible and sensible to cut opportunities for young people to attend college is completely unclear to me. These cuts will prevent even more young people from attending college in the years ahead. Already, many families in my congressional district cannot afford to send their children to college. Other families take out large student loans that their children must pay back of a 10-year period.

Federal TRIO programs have helped approximately 9 million young people complete high school or graduate from college since they were established. It is likely that these programs may be completely eliminated, leaving first-generation college students without the support and assistance needed to help them obtain their college degree.

In addition, this budget proposes that we cut community development block grants [CDBG's] by nearly 30 percent. Last year, my State of Illinois received \$42,500,000 that was

distributed to community development organizations across the 7th Congressional District and throughout the State to help create jobs, rehabilitate single family housing units, improve infrastructure and reduce threats to public health and safety, et cetera. A 30-percent cut will dramatically reduce the important work that CDBG's can do.

House Concurrent Resolution 67 also proposes making other cuts that could impact the future of our economy and work force. It cuts job training program funding by 20 percent and would completely eliminate the Department of Commerce. During the past 2 years, the Department of Commerce has helped the private sector create jobs through export promotion and programs like the manufacturer's extension partnership. As the Illinois District Export Council in Illinois indicated in a letter to me, "Part of America's future is in exporting. Export promotion programs not only create jobs and strengthens communities today, but they lay the foundation for strong, competitive, U.S. companies and jobs into the next century." Does it make sense to disarm ourselves when we most need to compete in global workplace?

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 67 also reduces funding for grants for energy conservation programs, phases out Federal funding for mass transit, and proposes a number of other short-sighted, irresponsible cuts.

I urge my colleagues to reject this foolish budget proposal. It will give America's richest and wealthiest citizens all the breaks and leave America's most vulnerable citizens with nothing. This, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not responsible and it is definitely nothing to be proud of.

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

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this budget.

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

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

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this conference report for two very simple and understandable reasons. I believe this conference report and this budget is extreme. I do not believe that we have to, in order to balance the budget, take the kind of actions that are being taken in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that it is a budget that is unfair and I say that for one simple reason above others. If you take the tax break that is in this budget, it comes to about \$245 billion over the period of years. If you take the Medicare cut, it is a little more than that; about \$270 billion.

As I will explain in a moment, the cuts in Medicare will be extremely harmful to ordinary American families. If we could reduce the tax break down to a more manageable level and focus it at middle-income families, we would not need to have Medicare cuts that are so severe and so deep in this budget.

Let me be more precise about what this means to ordinary families. Let me take what it means to the COLA increase on millions of seniors in our country. In the year 2002, they will get an annual COLA of about \$327, but because of the out-of-pocket increases that must be caused with this large of a cut in Medicare, they will face a cut in their COLA of \$157. In other words, half their COLA in the year 2002 will be taken away.

My colleagues may say \$150 is not a lot of money, but remember we are talking about people who are living on Social Security. It is the only check they get. It is the only income they have.

And why are we doing this? Why does it need to be this deep of a cut? Again, because we have a \$245 billion tax break, over half of which we believe goes to families who earn \$100,000 a year or more. That is extreme. That is unfair and that change, that one simple change in this budget, would have this kind of impact.

I want to take my colleagues back to people. This has to be looked at in terms of real people. Cecil Whitener and his wife Ethel live in Afton, MO, in my district. He fought in five major battles in World War II. He worked hard in a grocery store. He paid his taxes and paid into Medicare and Social Security all of his life.

In the year 2002, their benefit in Medicare will be \$850 a year less. Or put it another way, they will have to come up with \$850 more than they would under present law. That is a real life impact to these people.

□ 1530

But before we assume that this cut in Medicare is simply a problem for these folks who are today's senior citizens, let us understand that the impact of this is for all American families. This is Gina Stacer, who is trying to save for her twins' education. She and her husband live paycheck to paycheck. Her parents pay their medical bills with Medicare and social security.

Now, think about her and her husband and these kids and think about their middle-class status and what is going to happen if this budget conference report passes. It means people who are in middle-class squeeze are going to be squeezed even much more than they have been in the past because if she has to help pick up \$850 for her parents because of the cut in Medicare and because she gets cut in school lunches or cut in student loans where these kids hopefully soon will be able to go to school, she gets hit from both ends. And so what is now middle-class

squeeze becomes middle-class squash, and that is something that we should not allow to happen to the middle-income people of this country.

I say to you, my friends, we can do better than this. We can put together a budget that is fair for middle-income Americans, fair for people that have been stuck in place for the last 10 years making the same amount of money.

We do not have to have a budget that gives huge tax breaks to people who already have it made and take it out of the hide of the hard-working middle-income people of this country.

Vote down this conference report, and we can do better than this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. One simple little question: If they say that we could do it, we can balance the budget, why have not they done it for 25 years? I cannot figure it out.

Now, we have been in for less than 6 months, and we are going to do it.

Let me say a couple of things. First of all, we signed a contract last fall, last September. We made promises to the American people: Balance the budget, line item veto, commonsense legal reform, welfare reform, cut taxes, cut committees, cut bureaucracy. They said it could not be done. We did it in 100 days for one reason: because we believe in keeping our promises. We believe in real results. We did it, and the American people appreciate the fact that we are politicians where our deeds are meeting our rhetoric.

Is it not just great that you make a promise and you can come here to this House and you can deliver on it? And what we are about to do today is to deliver on something that all of the skeptics said could not be done. You think about that list of what we have already delivered on, the commonsense legal reform, cutting committees, cutting bureaucracy, giving tax relief to Americans, welfare reform, this is what Americans want.

You know, some people accuse us of getting this from a pollster. Yes, we got it from pollsters. We got it when we went to the supermarket. We got it when we went to the gym. We got it when we rode the bus. We got it on the plane, because we listened to Americans who get up and go to work every day and said, "That is our agenda." We made it our agenda. We delivered to the American people, and we are here today to balance the budget, provide tax relief, and keep the greatest of all of our promises, and we ought to feel very good about it.

I want to thank the Democrats who joined us on the contract and thank the Democrats who joined us when we passed this house budget resolution.

Now, why are we balancing the budget? Well, Greenspan, Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, probably said it best, "Children will have a higher standard of living than

their parents." That is America's greatest legacy, your kids will be better off than you. They will have more opportunity than you had. Your legacy will be that you left a healthier America for your children.

Second, improvement in the purchasing power of incomes, greater exports, significant drop in interest rates. That is homes for everybody. That is new businesses.

But let us get to the bottom line about this budget proposal. We heard about how draconian it is. First of all, Medicare: In our plan, we will go from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion. The only people who think that going from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion are living, I do not know, maybe in the 1950's, because, you see, we do not use this language anymore in America, in Arizona, in Michigan, in Florida, in Ohio, all across this country. When you go from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion, that is an increase; that is an increase.

Now, we hear the talk about those that want to go to \$1.8 trillion, and the talk about those two senior citizens. If we do not fix Medicare by the year 2002, there will not be any left for them, and we are doing this to preserve the Medicare system and to show the greatest amount of compassion that is possible within the dollars that we have and to serve Americans with quality care and choice.

Now, folks, when you get down to the issue of total spending in the Federal Government, we are going to grow from \$9,500,000,000,000 to \$12 trillion. Can you believe that? From \$9.5 trillion to \$12 trillion, and there are some that say that is not enough. Do you know what Americans are saying when they see those numbers? "Why are you spending so much? Why are you spending so much?" The reason? Because we are on a glide path to balance this budget by downsizing government, eliminating duplication and red tape, providing tax relief, and achieving what Alan Greenspan said was imperative for saving the next generation.

We can do it, ladies and gentlemen, by just slowing the growth in government. That is what it takes.

This is not a dire budget. This is not a revolutionary budget. This is a commonsense budget to get us in balance.

Now, let me suggest to all of you that this balanced budget is designed to achieve two things: One, it is about the children and the next generation. And do you know what Americans tell me, and they are telling all of you as you go through airports? Do you know what they do? They grab you by the wrists and they say, "Don't stop. Do not give in. Don't cave in. Please keep it going. Balance the budget. Save my kids. Fix America. Ignore the special interests." That is what they are telling us as we go through the airports and the communities of our country.

And we also want to give them a little of their money back. As SAM JOHNSON put it, it is their money not our money.

You know what I want to close with as we look forward to bipartisan support, we run for office, we leave our families, we get on planes, we run all over, and we wonder sometimes why we do it. Today we are making history. Today this is a giant step for saving America, and every Member should leave this Chamber today with their heads held high, realizing this is why we came, to put America over politics, to put the future over the present, and, frankly, folks, the American people appreciate it.

God bless America. God bless this Congress in taking this giant step because we are about to guarantee a prosperous America and a better planet.

Vote for the resolution.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, last year we promised Americans certain tax cuts: to working parents we promised a \$500 tax credit for their children, and we promised to end the tax penalty against married couples. To older Americans we promised to repeal President Clinton's massive tax increase on Social Security. And we promised to end the unfair rules that penalize retired Americans who work part time. Finally we promised that we would create economic growth and new jobs by reducing taxes on savings and capital investment.

More than 80 Members of this House sent a letter to the Speaker seeking from the budget conference a balanced budget by the year 2002 and the tax cuts promised by the Contract With America. We resolved that we can and that we must do both. The text of the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

Unfortunately, this conference report misses the mark. While it does include \$245 billion in tax relief for families and businessmen and women, it fails to roll back the President's massive 1993 tax increase on seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the most consistent theme I hear from the lunch counters of Muncie, IN, to the factory cafeteria in Anderson, IN, is that every American is overtaxed.

I will support this rule and the underlying conference report because it is a significant step in the right direction. We have all summer to continue to cut spending and to seek greater tax cuts in the budget reconciliation bill this fall. And so I will support this rule and this conference report because it establishes a 7-year balanced budget plan does offer some tax relief.

Let this also be a notice, however, that many freshmen and senior Members alike intend to keep our promises to the American people. We would not support any reconciliation bill that fails to keep our promise to offer all of the child tax cuts and capital gains tax cuts and fails to eliminate Clinton's Social Security tax increase. Moreover, in our minds this resolution establishes a floor—a level of tax relief under which we will not go—and we will fight to restore all of the Contract's tax cuts this fall.

MAY 25, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are writing to express our strong support for your courageous and successful efforts to pass a budget resolution which ensures a balanced budget by 2002 and retains the full value of tax relief passed earlier by the House of Representatives.

We are strongly convinced that America will thrive in the next century only if governed by a limited and responsible federal government. The federal government must live within its means and must not crush the prosperity of its citizens. Deficit spending and excessive taxation have together served to expand the power of the government while reducing the power of the people. A balanced budget and tax relief are not only compatible, but they are also essential for restoring the American dream.

Our Founding Fathers organized this republic to: establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. This inheritance has been neglected. For too long Congress has sought to protect the state more fiercely than it has sought to serve the people. We must persevere to restore government of, by and for the people.

You can count on our votes against any budget resolution conference report that fails to balance the budget or significantly diminishes the tax relief passed by the House.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with this conference report. I have been a strong supporter of a balanced budget. However, we must ensure fairness and equity in achieving it. The American public is ready to tighten its belt as long as we all shoulder part of the load. The Coalition, a group of conservative Democrats which I helped form, proposed an alternative budget earlier this year which is based on fairness.

This conference report is simply not fair. Foreign aid, which is about 1 percent of the total budget is being cut by \$1.8 billion this year while agriculture, which is also about 1 percent of the budget, sustains \$13.3 billion in cuts over the next 7 years. This budget takes the strap to American farmers while sparing dozens of foreign subsidy programs. Medicare and Medicaid recipients stand to lose \$450 billion over the next 7 years under this proposal, at least \$75 billion more than is necessary to save the program. Students will lose \$10 billion in loan assistance to attend schools, when this is one of the most rewarding investments our Government can make. I supported the Coalition alternative because it is tough and honest. It is less Government. Most importantly, it is fair.

This conference report reserves the greatest amount of spending cuts for the last 2 years. This means we run the risk that future Congresses might not be willing to make the tough cuts. I am a strong supporter of tax relief, but in order to achieve it, the committee bill has inequitably targeted agriculture, education, job training, and Medicare among other things. We first need to ensure the future of our children, and then give tax relief to ourselves.

I hope my colleagues join me in voting against this report because a more intelligent, equitable balanced budget proposal exists, namely the one put forward by the Coalition.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996. This measure will cut \$1.2 trillion from quality of life programs for the primary purpose of funding a tax cut to the wealthy. The tax cut is proudly touted by our republican colleagues as the crown jewel in the GOP Contract With America. I strongly believe that hard-working American families do not want to pay for a tax break for the wealth-

iest individuals on the backs of the weakest in our society. That is just wrong, immoral, and unfair.

Yesterday, the Members of the House spoke with righteous indignation about the burning of the American flag. My colleagues, I ask that you have righteous indignation against making life-threatening cuts in vital quality-of-life programs on behalf of those in the dawn of life; our children—on behalf of those in the twilight of life; the elderly; and on behalf of those who are in the shadow of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

We must not let politics outweigh the needs of the American people. We must not ignore the pain and suffering that will result from the devastating cuts in vital human capital programs including health care, housing, food and nutrition, human services, education, and employment training.

The \$270 billion cut in Medicare funding means that the elderly would have to pay nearly \$3,000 more for health care services in the form of higher premiums, deductibles, and coinsurance. This increased cost of health care could eat up nearly 40 to 50 percent of their Social Security COLA.

The \$182 billion cut in Medicaid means that nearly 7 million children and nearly 1 million elderly disabled would lose health care coverage. Tens of millions of Americans would lose important benefits such as preventive screening services for children, home care, and hospice.

For each \$10 million cut in the Healthy Start Program, 33,000 prenatal visits would be eliminated, 3,000 pediatric appointments would be eliminated, 5,800 clients would not receive child care, and 3,200 clients would not receive skill and job training services. The 50 percent cut in funding for the National Health Service Corps would eliminate primary health care services to 500,000 people living in medically underserved urban and rural areas.

The 33-percent cut in education and related programs would deny millions of students vital education needs including safe and drug-free schools; concentrated educational instruction in reading and math; and education technology. In addition, access to and success in postsecondary education for the neediest students is imperiled by drastic funding cuts in the TRIO program. The \$10 billion cut in student aid and threats to the continued viability of the Pell grant and campus-based student aid programs will saddle students with increasingly heavy loan debt and crushing interest payments. The increased debt burden places at risk and out of reach the dream of a college education.

The nearly \$19 billion cut to school lunch, school breakfast, summer food, special milk, child and adult food services would force millions of needy Americans to have to choose between food and housing. Without the low-income home energy assistance, millions of elderly would be forced to choose between food and heat. My colleagues, these are not choices.

The 20-percent cut in employment training programs will deny millions of Americans the essential job training services they need to succeed in the labor market; it will deny displaced workers the re-employment opportunities they so desperately need; and will deny summer jobs to over 600,000 youth who need and want to work.

Mr. Speaker, we must not force the weak to carry the weight of the strong. The Republican

budget will weaken the foundation of our economy and place our children's future at risk. House Concurrent Resolution 67 is irresponsible and devastating to the lives of ordinary Americans. If these are the results of the Republicans' promise made-promise kept philosophy, surely some promises are definitely meant to be broken.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to show compassion and to stand up in defense of our Nation's children, elderly, veterans, and hard-working families. Vote against the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference committee report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, a historic budget resolution.

For the first time in more than a generation, the House of Representatives stands ready to adopt a budget resolution that provides for a balanced Federal budget by the year 2002.

The goal of a balanced budget is not just an abstract exercise that some economists or green-eye-shade types thought up in their ivory tower.

It is an essential economic tool to get the savings and capital investment we desperately need for research and development, and new plant and equipment to rebuild the American economy; keep us competitive in the global economy; and create the good jobs at good wages we need for this generation and those to come.

Earlier this year, I voted once again in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I did so because I believe that our country's long-term economic health demands that the Federal Government's fiscal house be put in order.

While the balanced budget amendment was narrowly defeated in the Senate, the need for Congress to do the right thing, and enact legislation that brings the budget into balance, remains as strong today as it was then.

Our interest payments on the public debt, currently exceed \$200 billion a year, and are projected to increase to a mind-boggling \$310 billion within the next 4 years! Much of these interest payments are going abroad to foreign investors who buy our Treasury notes. In other words, this capital is being drained out of our economy and exported.

If nothing is done, our country is headed for a fiscal disaster.

At the same time, in order to avoid this calamity, balancing the budget will require everyone in the United States to share some of the sacrifice associated with reducing the Federal Government's projected increases in spending by more than \$900 billion over the next 7 years.

While I recognize that the opponents of House Concurrent Resolution 67 can point to this particular detail or that specific detail as unacceptable, the fact remains that the Budget Committee's plan does not give anyone a free ride as we struggle toward a balanced budget.

The domestic discretionary budget, which provides funds for most Federal education, housing, environmental, and health programs, will have to make do with \$190 billion less over the next 7 years than originally anticipated.

The non-health care entitlement programs, such as Federal employees' pensions, crop subsidies, and welfare programs to name just a few, are facing \$174 billion less in funding than originally assumed.

And, while I would support additional reductions in the defense budget, this budget plan does exert continued downward pressure on defense spending. No department can be exempt from budget cutbacks if we are to ever reach a balanced budget.

And Medicare and Medicaid, the Federal health care programs for the elderly and low-income respectively, will be asked to make due with \$450 billion in less spending than current budget trends allow for.

Without question, this area of savings raises the most concern for me, and I must state my serious skepticism about how much of these truly dramatic changes can, or should, be accomplished in the near-term, if at all. By no means will I balance the budget on the backs of the sick elderly. We must proceed with great caution.

Some of the specific Medicare and Medicaid reform recommendations that have been discussed in recent weeks will be subject to intense analysis by this Member of Congress as the House Ways and Means and Commerce Committees wrestle with the reconciliation instructions they will receive from this document.

But, absent some significant reform what will happen to these essential programs?

Well, for the second year in a row, the trustees for the Medicare program have concluded that the program will go bankrupt in 7 years if nothing is changed.

Clearly, strong action and bold leadership is needed to ensure that our elderly will be able to receive necessary medical treatment through the Medicare program, and that Medicare will be there for many hard-working families who will become eligible for Medicare in the next 10 or 20 years.

Again we must proceed in good faith—keep our promises to our elderly.

I, for one, support the establishment of a Bipartisan Blue Ribbon Medicare Commission—modeled after the very successful Greenspan Commission on Social Security in the mid-1980's—to make recommendations for preserving and protecting this vital program, which the Congress could enact confident that there is not any hidden political agenda to the recommendations.

All too often, members have implied that there can be short-term quick fixes to the program's current structure. There are no easy, quick fixes here.

When we talk about preserving and protecting Medicare's long-term solvency, let's do it right and put aside partisan wrangling. The American people are tired of partisan bickering and sniping. They want us to face the issues intelligently and fairly.

While the Budget Committee's plan does call for some dramatic changes to these programs, we must keep in mind that the alternative is completely unacceptable: a bankrupt Medicare program that does not help the elderly and is not there for anyone else either.

With respect to the ongoing efforts to provide middle-class families with some tax relief, I supported H.R. 1215 earlier this year because it contained many elements—such as expanded Individual Retirement Accounts, capital gains tax relief, expanded capital investment deductions for small businesses—of a save and invest in America agenda, which I have long advocated.

However, I was one of a small group of Republicans that petitioned our leadership to

defer any tax reductions until the Congressional Budget Office had certified that the budget was, in fact, going to be balanced. Unfortunately, these preconditions have been significantly modified in the final version of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

Consequently, we must be mindful that the enactment of tax relief legislation will result in lower Federal revenues in the short term, which in turn requires that the Congress cut spending further in order to offset these losses.

The final conference committee report provides for no more than \$245 billion in tax relief, meaning that the Congress will not have to find an additional \$110 billion spending cuts over 7 years to compensate for the tax relief package as originally proposed by the House.

I would add that I have joined other Republicans who are already moving to limit the so-called family tax credit to families with incomes of less than \$100,000. I fully support this effort and working to see it adopted.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, approving the Budget Committee's conference report represents the first step in our annual budget process. The 13 regular appropriations bills, combined with an omnibus budget reconciliation package, will be where the nitty-gritty details of this budget plan are hashed-out.

That process will not be without difficulty, but as we prepare to enact legislation that balances the Federal budget we should not kid ourselves into thinking that it will be easy to do. At the same time, we should acknowledge the terrible cost to our Nation if we do nothing.

Balancing the Federal budget is essential to protect our Nation's long-term financial health, and to ensure that the country our children and grandchildren inherit is as great as the one our parents gave us.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I rise today to speak against the cuts this budget resolution inflicts on the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA].

While we all support sound and responsible spending, the cuts to the FAA budget are neither. The result of these cuts will give us skies that are more crowded, equipment that is older, air traffic control personnel that are even more overworked, and air travel that is more dangerous.

While air traffic has grown more than 6 percent over the last 2 years, the FAA budget experienced a real decline of 6 percent—that's a \$600 million decrease.

The budget resolution conference agreement cuts an additional \$10 billion from transportation spending, cuts which will jeopardize the safety and efficiency of the aviation system proposed by the President.

Under this budget proposal—a safe and efficient aviation system for the nation will be dramatically jeopardized.

The FAA's ability to improve weather safety equipment and to prevent accidents would be compromised.

Introduction of satellite navigation technology would be delayed at least 5 years, costing air carriers millions of dollars per year in efficiencies.

The FAA would be less able to respond to domestic and international terrorism. Security specialists would be cut by one-third, ending the FAA's ability to assure compliance with security regulations to provide on-site monitoring and to assist air carriers experiencing major terrorist threats. We need look no further than

the current pall of fear that hangs over Los Angeles International airport to imagine the likely effect of security cutbacks.

The FAA would no longer be able to certify new aircraft, engines, or parts. These responsibilities would be transferred to private interests.

All FAA international offices would be closed, eliminating FAA's international presence for safety, security, and certification functions and undermining our goal of ensuring U.S. passenger safety worldwide.

Research into better methods of protecting passengers from inflight and post-crash fires would end altogether.

From fiscal year 1995 to 2002, the work force of air traffic controllers and flight service technicians would be reduced 44 percent—despite a 34-percent increase in the number of passengers and a 17-percent increase in commercial operations.

Flight service stations and control towers would be closed to the detriment of general aviation and small communities. Hundreds of communities in all 50 States would lose jobs and air traffic services. And, almost 105,000 flights would be delayed annually, at a cost to carriers and passengers that exceeds \$2.3 billion.

Equipment-related delays—caused by funding shortfalls for new technology and skilled maintenance technicians—would rise dramatically from 4,000 to 50,000 per year, and additional operating costs would grow for carriers and passengers.

We are all aware of the desperate need to guarantee 100 percent safety for the flying public. We are too familiar with the tragic consequences when that safety is compromised.

Mr. Speaker, we all benefit from the FAA's ability to provide safe and timely travel—let's not jeopardize that by approving this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to keep the skies friendly—and safe—and reject this budget resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution conference agreement.

I am committed to balancing the budget. That requires difficult choices, and over the years I have not shied away from the tough votes to cut spending. In fact, I have voted for every serious comprehensive deficit reduction proposal—under both Republican and Democratic Presidents—since coming to Congress.

But this budget proposal, although well-intentioned, is poorly conceived.

This resolution calls for making \$270 billion in cuts from Medicare, yet, the Republicans have not produced a single specific proposal on how to achieve these savings. When taken together with the \$180 billion in cuts to Medicaid, these cuts could jeopardize the well-being of the best health care system in the world, to say nothing of what it can do to the affordability of health care for seniors, the ability of seniors to use the doctor of their choice, and the viability of teaching hospitals and the medical education programs they support. Finally, the ability of the aged and the disabled to receive the nursing home care they so desperately need will be jeopardized.

And why would we place Medicare and Medicaid including long-term care in such peril? So that the Republicans can pay for an ill-conceived tax break mainly for the privileged few.

At a time when U.S. income inequality is the worst among industrialized nations and is at

its greatest level since records have been kept, this budget handsomely rewards the privileged few at the expense of everybody else.

The Treasury warned that over half of the benefits of the original House plan would go to the top 12 percent of taxpayers, and there's no indication that this package will be any different. Yet this is the only group whose incomes went up and whose effective tax rates went down over the past decade and a half.

The rest of America, whose incomes stagnated or declined during the same period, not only get the crumbs in terms of tax breaks, but bear the brunt of paying for the whole tax package through greater cuts in Medicare, student loans, veterans benefits, and other middle-class programs.

Further, this budget will dull the edge of America's future competitiveness by gutting our Nation's investment in education across-the-board, at a time when more and more jobs call for greater skills and abilities.

And for what? I am willing to accept a modest increase in inequality if there's a reasonable prospect of significantly greater economic growth for all. But these tax cuts can't deliver. Treasury, CBO, CRS, and Joint Committee on Taxation, and a host of economists across the political spectrum have all concluded that the benefits, if any, are likely to be quite small.

Finally, I think the American people have the right to know the exact price for these tax cuts and for balancing the budget generally. Republicans claim that they've paid for the tax cuts and that they've committed themselves to achieving a balanced budget by 2002. The truth is that the major offset in the bill is a promise to cut spending in the future, and that the commitment to balance the budget rests still more promises to cut in the future.

None of these promises are backed by specific spending cuts. To make matters worse, Republicans have gerry-rigged the tax cuts so that most of the revenue loss comes in the years beyond the budget window, so under House rules they don't have to pay for the full cost of these tax cuts.

I am all for real, responsible deficit reduction. But this budget in many ways is not real, and in any event is not responsible.

That is why I am voting against the budget resolution conference agreement.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the 1996 budget resolution. It is imperative that we take steps to correct our current budget dilemma. I believe today is as good as any day to set in motion a plan which will bring our government back to an environment of fiscal responsibility.

Many folks are concerned this legislation will take away benefits which they now receive. In reality, if we do not make a concerted effort to balance our budget by encouraging efficiency of Government services, we will be unable to offer any assistance in the near future as a result of irresponsible budget decisions. It is my belief this budget resolution will allow those decisions to be made at the appropriate committee level.

The projected savings in Medicare and Medicaid are most troubling to me, as their numbers are so high. However, there is nothing in the budget resolution that requires the committee of jurisdiction on which I serve to adopt the assumptions used in reaching the \$270 and \$180 billion savings. We must look

at all options while keeping in mind our commitment to the American people who contributed to the Medicare insurance program throughout their working lives, and those low-income individuals who need the helping hand of the Government. I believe all of us recognize the merits of these programs as well as the need to insure their solvency by slowing the rate of growth in these programs, by asking health care providers and beneficiaries to help us find fair ways to make the program solvent for future generations; and by increasing choice and individual responsibility without decreasing benefits and access to the best health care system in the world.

I urge my colleagues to act in a bipartisan manner and vote in favor of this resolution, which will allow the important process of balancing our budget to move forward as well as allow future generations to have the opportunity to enjoy the American Dream.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 budget. I strongly disagree with the priorities laid out in this document—especially the policy of gutting Federal health, education, and safety-net programs for average Americans in order to provide tax cuts for the most affluent members of our society.

Now is not the time for massive tax cuts. We desperately need to reduce the growing Federal deficit. The budget plan contained in this conference report would reduce Federal receipts by \$245 billion over 7 years. Such tax cuts would force deep, irresponsible cuts in Medicare and Medicaid—as well as other important Federal programs like education, training, infrastructure, and nutrition programs.

We all know that we must reduce the Federal Government's massive structural deficit. To do that, we have to make difficult choices about worthwhile programs and scarce resources. However, I don't think that many of my colleagues really understand the magnitude of the cuts required under this budget resolution—or the impact that such changes would have on the vast majority of people in this country. The cuts proposed for Medicare, Medicaid, education and training programs, urban redevelopment, and Federal safety-net programs will devastate millions of families.

Moreover, if the experience of the last 15 years has taught us anything, it is that we never have as good a grip on deficit reduction as we think we do. We should have learned to err on the side of caution and conservatism when estimating deficits 5—or 7—years down the line. Consequently, I believe that it is irresponsible to adopt a massive tax cut at this time.

Finally, I believe that the tax cuts proposed in this budget are distributionally unfair. These tax cuts are targeted toward the rich; many working-class families won't see a penny from them. If we want to reduce the tax burden on the hard-pressed middle class, we should rethink our approach. Honest hard-working families that often hold down several jobs—and still have to struggle to make ends meet—need tax relief a lot more than America's most affluent families.

For these reasons, I urge the House to reject the conference report on the budget resolution and to begin again. It's not too late to draw up a budget that cuts the deficit responsibly without stabbing middle-class families and the elderly in the back.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in somewhat reluctant opposition to this budget resolution.

Without a doubt, the time to act on slowing the growth of Federal spending and Federal programs is upon us. We cannot continue to borrow and spend and push our country into bankruptcy.

Today we are faced with the blueprint for how the Republican leadership plans to reach a balanced budget in 7 years. I've spent enough time studying the issues and talking about them with people in my district that I could be a budget architect, and if I had a seat at the table, I would make a few changes in the design.

I would soften the blow on working families who struggle to save and invest enough to send their kids to college and pay their rent or mortgages. And I would tell them that the best tax cut we can give them and their children is real deficit reduction.

I have held countless town meetings to discuss with the people of the 19th District the very real budget decisions which we must make. People in my part of Illinois are not clamoring for tax cuts which cannot be afforded any more than they want to keep open obsolete agencies or continue to fund ineffective programs. They want to make sure the priority needs are met and put a brake on spending which we can't afford.

Balancing the budget won't be easy and it won't come without the loss of some programs and activities which people in the 19th District appreciate. I am more than willing to shoulder that responsibility because the deficit and accumulated debt is the No. 1 problem facing this country. But one of my great regrets is that the highly-charged partisan atmosphere in Congress won't allow us to craft a plan which would have broad, bipartisan support. I credit the Republican leadership for putting this package together, with the regret that we could not find more middle ground on some of our basic concerns.

The real disappointment is that all of what is being done today will be nothing but empty rhetoric when it comes time to put it into law. The Congress will pass legislation which follows the unfair and unrealistic instructions contained in this resolution, the President will, rightly so, veto those bills, those vetoes will stand and we will have to come back and do what we should be doing right now, which is working in a bipartisan way to balance the budget. I stand ready to assist in that effort. And so, it is with reluctance that I vote against the resolution, in hopes that we work together to address the budget crisis facing this country.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to remind my colleagues of what carried a Republican majority to the House of Representatives: it was an electorate demanding fundamental changes in failed government agencies and policies, and a vast reduction of the growing Federal deficit.

The budget resolution before us certainly creates a clear path to fiscal soundness. However, we continue to face the difficult challenge of implementing this plan, including the restructuring of our Federal departments and agencies. As chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and on behalf of its Republican members, I would like to reaffirm our commitment toward creating a

new 21st Century Government that is less intrusive, less costly and more responsive to the American taxpayer.

The American people have lost patience with a government that grows in size but not in service. For instance, the U.S. General Accounting Office has documented the problem of massive duplication within our Federal departments in reporting that the Department of Commerce shares its mission with at least 71 Federal departments, agencies, and offices. As a result of this duplication and other inefficiencies within the Federal Government, the American taxpayer and future generations will bear the burden of a U.S. tax receipt system that is 13 times the size it was in 1960.

I support the budget resolution's goal of eliminating the Department of Commerce as an initial step in the overall restructuring process. The next crucial step is determining whether consolidation, privatization, localization, or elimination will produce the most effective and innovative results within each agency. Republican members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee pledge to continue these reorganization efforts by evaluating all Federal agencies and departments to determine if their missions and functions are still viable resources to the American public.

In fact, next month, the Committee will begin a series of nationwide field hearings that will serve as an open forum for experts in organizational management, as well as the public, to voice their ideas about what they want their government to do for them and what their government should look like. Let's allow the American public to have a voice in this historic process of change.

In closing, I would like to reiterate the significant amount of resources that can be saved, over the long-term, through the restructuring of inefficient Federal Government agencies. I remain dedicated to creating an innovative government through the use and guidance of private and public sector experts in the restructuring field.

The time has come for citizens, experts, and lawmakers to join together in the common cause of creating a 21st Century Government. Through a collaborative effort the Government we create can be as effective and innovative as the Government we envision.

I thank the Chairman and yield back.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker. The conference agreement on the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution includes proposed savings of about \$4.4 billion over the next 7 years from the assumption that the Davis-Bacon Act will be repealed. However, the specific assumption for repeal of the Act is not binding on the committees of jurisdiction over Davis-Bacon and does not prejudice the enactment of legislation to repeal the Act. With this in mind, I plan to support the Conferees' Report.

However, I would like to be very clear in stating that I have serious doubts as to whether the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act will actually result in any serious savings—let alone savings amounting to \$4.4 billion—and I question the need for this language in the Conferees' Report. Several studies have indicated that repealing the Act would be, at best, neutral with respect to Federal construction costs when compared to lost revenue due to reduced wages.

The Davis-Bacon Act has been a focus of congressional consideration since the 1950's. There appears to be little indisputable evi-

dence with respect to its impact. In light of this, some have called the Act a Special Interest 'dole-out' that is earmarked specifically for organized labor. But this is an unfair assessment. If there is any clear evidence with respect to the Davis-Bacon Act, it is that the Act has effectively taken the wages of working men and women out of the Federal construction bidding process. I hope that my colleagues understand this. And I urge them to vote against any measures to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my great appreciation to Mr. KASICH, the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, on his efforts to maintain Congress' commitment to our Nation's veterans during this extremely difficult process of balancing the budget.

The other members of the Budget Committee, especially Mr. HOKE, Mrs. MOLINARI, and Mr. BASS of the National Security Budget Task Force, also deserve great credit for their efforts.

These Members worked long and hard to assure that veterans were not unfairly singled out for any new cuts, and that the budget was not balanced on the backs of veterans.

Unfortunately demagoguery and misinformation about this resolution have been used by the administration to scare veterans into fearing the absolute worst about this budget.

These have been desperate administration tactics to confuse veterans and steer their attention away from the administration's own budget proposals which in some ways would be worse for veterans than the recommendations of this conference report.

In unprecedented partisan fashion administration officials have talked about a mean spirit on Capitol Hill toward veterans.

When the reality has been that the mandatory savings provisions proposed by the House Budget Committee have simply extended current law and items passed by previous Congresses.

Additionally, most of these proposals were signed into law by President Clinton in 1993, and included in both of his budget proposals submitted this year.

The reality is that this conference agreement recommends an increase in annual veterans' spending from \$36.9 billion to \$40.4 billion per year over the next 7 years.

This amounts to a total of \$276 billion—an increase of \$39.5 billion over the last 7 years.

This is during a period when the veteran population is rapidly declining.

The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that between 1990 and the year 2010, the veteran population will decrease by 7 million, or 26 percent.

There were dire predictions earlier this year that the budget would contain entitlement reform proposals devastating veterans benefits.

The veterans organizations testified in great opposition to means testing disability compensation, taxing veterans benefits, or removing 10 and 20 percent service-connected disabled veterans from the compensation roles.

None of these proposals are included in this budget conference report.

And based on my dealings with the Budget chairman over the past few months, I can assure veterans that none of them were ever se-

riously considered by the House Budget Committee.

The conference report does mandate reconciliation savings of \$6.4 billion over 7 years.

This is about the same amount of savings achieved by the Reconciliation Acts passed in 1990 and 1993.

Many Members, who are now complaining about this budget's impact upon veterans voted for these same proposals in 1990 and 1993.

They may want to check their prior votes.

All veterans will benefit from the financial improvements balancing the budget can bring to the American economy.

Younger veterans with families and children will certainly benefit from the \$500 per child tax credit, regardless of their income.

Additionally, this budget protects the Social Security benefits of older veterans.

Others have highlighted the list of economic benefits a balanced budget will provide so I will not repeat them at this time.

The latest dire predictions veterans have been scared by is that this budget resolution results in closed VA medical centers.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

As a matter of fact, over the next 5 years, the President's budget proposes \$339 million less for VA health care than this conference report.

It is contradictory for administration officials to claim the budget conference agreement results in hospital closures over 7 years and that the President's budget proposal would not.

One could certainly ask how many hospitals would have closed if funding were at the President's recommended level of the 10 years of his latest budget plan.

This resolution does not mandate or require any specific level of spending on VA health care.

As all Members and administration officials know, the appropriation bill sets the specific spending level for VA health care.

The appropriators will make decisions on spending levels for VA health care next month.

I will work with the Appropriations Committee in the same manner as I have with the Budget Committee to assure adequate spending levels for VA health care programs.

I encourage all Members to make their priorities known to the Appropriations Committee.

The rising national debt and interest on that debt have created a crisis which Congress must face now.

It is truly a matter of saving our country from financial ruin.

Our children and grandchildren will either inherit a declining standard of living or gain freedom from the financial excesses of our generation.

We can either pass a balanced budget and work to protect high priority veterans programs, or go with the President's budget, ignore our national financial crisis, and add over a trillion dollars to the debt our children will have to repay.

I urge Members to support the conference report, to save our country's financial future and protect our veterans.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House-Senate Republican budget conference report.

This proposal, a compromise written by the House and Senate Budget Committees, would give the very wealthy an enormous tax break

while at the same time devastating Medicare and other vital programs. I voted against this package as a conferee and will vote no on final passage in the House.

The goal of this budget proposal is one I share: balancing the federal budget by the year 2002. In January, I voted for a constitutional amendment to balance our federal budget. I believe we must end the continued policy of running billion-dollar deficits every year which add to the national debt that must be paid by our children and grandchildren.

But we should not balance the budget by cutting student loans, Medicare, Social Security, funding for veterans and infrastructure while offering a \$245 billion tax cut. This outrageous cut will give the wealthiest families a cut of over \$15,000 while giving most middle-income families an average of only \$500 in tax relief.

We must also balance our budget in a way which does not put such a tremendous burden on our nation's elderly. Last fall, during town meetings with my constituents, I talked about the "Contract with America," and its potential impact on Social Security and Medicare. I suggested that if the Republican plan were enacted, our seniors would see huge Medicare cuts, higher Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket costs, and an effort to cut Social Security. If you examine the Republican budget closely, it does all three.

It cuts \$270 billion from Medicare over seven years, meaning that the service currently provided by Medicare will be significantly less in 2002. By cutting the Medicare program by 25 percent in 2002, out-of-pocket costs for seniors will increase by over \$1000 in 2002. And, this budget begins the dangerous concept of reducing Social Security cost-of-living-adjustments, beginning in 1999, by altering the Consumer Price Index. This will reduce the average benefit by \$240 per person.

The Republicans have also suggested this plan will actually balance the budget in 2002. Unfortunately, their proposal relies on unsound economics and budget gimmicks to reach a balanced budget. This budget assumes a \$170 billion "economic bonus" between 1996 and 2002 for attempting to balance the budget. This is based on a rosy scenario that our financial markets would react to lower interest rates by an optimistic 2 percent in 2002. Without this bonus, the budget is not balanced, and the promises behind this budget remain unfulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget. I believe if we got rid of the \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy and used those funds to help keep Medicare solvent; if we asked the very wealthy instead to pay their fair share; restored some funding for some of our most needed initiatives, such as student loans; and did not tamper with Social Security, we would reach this goal. Unfortunately, a majority of my colleagues did not agree with our efforts to make these changes in the Budget Committee.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the Kasich budget plan on the floor of the House.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference agreement on the budget that we have before us today. Like the Republican budget proposal which passed the House last month, this is a measure which seeks to pay for the Republicans' tax breaks for wealthy individuals on the backs of chil-

dren's nutrition and the elderly's Medicare and at the expense of sound education, health and welfare benefits.

The conference agreement worked out by the Republicans is, to say the least, disappointing. In this time of fiscal stringency, it makes no sense for the Republicans to continue to insist on providing costly unfair tax breaks to wealthier Americans and corporations while cutting off programs which invest in our nation's future, our children and our people. Yet that is what this conference agreement does. The size of the tax breaks is slightly different from the House-passed resolution, now they cost \$245 billion over just five years, but they remain unfair and slated for enactment before the budget paper promises are close to being fulfilled.

Surely, the Republicans do not expect the American people to believe that these huge unfair tax breaks, which are a throwback to the failed economic policies of the 1980's, will be an investment in our country's future? The Republicans make this claim even as they plot deep cuts in student loan funds by \$10 billion over seven years, as they cut funding for education across the board, which is one of the most important investments our country can make. At a time when jobs demand more preparation and the cost of a college education is rising twice as fast as income, cutting education funding is indeed a losing proposition. We need to support education as a budget priority, not as a political throwaway to pay for the wealthy's tax breaks. This conference agreement has it backward.

The GOP budget further digs the deficit hole deeper with seventy billion dollars more for the Pentagon, wed to cold war mentality.

At the same time this is a budget which not only slams doors shut on Americans wanting to gain an education, but sadly decimates programs which provide a safety net for our nation's elderly and poor. The budget cuts \$270 billion from Medicare, \$182 billion from Medicaid, \$100 billion from welfare programs, and another \$71 billion from other entitlement programs. In the seven year Republican paper promise to achieve a balance, ironically economists can often predict 7 months in advance much less seven years into the future.

In the absence of any real explanation, the Republicans simply split the difference on the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid between the House and Senate plans. Thus, the amount of the cuts were arbitrarily set, without rhyme, reason or thought as to the consequences on people today. Without contemplating the effects, the Republicans today promise draconian cuts that will mean fewer benefits, higher out-of-pocket costs for seniors, and less choice of doctors. This is the GOP blueprint. Nearly 83 percent of Medicare benefits go to seniors with incomes of \$25,000 or less. Just think about what that does to seniors who rely upon the Federal Medicare promise. The proposed reductions would have a devastating effect on these people. Likewise, Medicaid is the only major Federal source of funding for long-term care and the proposed cuts will have drastic results for our nation's seniors, with over one-half the benefits flowing to elderly Americans.

The irony of this is that in the last Congress, the Republicans refused to support meaningful comprehensive health care reform, saying there was no crisis in health care. Now they have conveniently discovered ironically a

slightly improved Medicare Trustees Annual Report and bemoan it as a crisis. Actually the 1995 report suggests a slight improvement over 1994. The GOP is going to solve this health care crisis by cutting benefits to seniors and reimbursements to health care providers while giving tax breaks to wealthy Americans. This is not the approach that will protect and preserve Medicare and the elderly and help finally to rationalize the health care system.

It's an unfair plan, it's unworkable but no doubt the GOP will score the political points and then try to dump the problem and duty on the President or the Democrats.

The priorities outlined in this budget agreement are outrageous. We ought to be offering hope by acknowledging the reality that the Federal Government needs to remain a partner in supporting the basic needs of our citizens. The people we represent. However, what I am seeing is an erosion of support for working families and an eradication of support for those who cannot make ends meet in order to give wealthier folks unreasonable tax breaks. Republican paper promises and up front tax breaks with back loaded deficit reduction don't signify political courage, as they would have us believe, but political pandering yet another postponement of fiscal reality. Republican priorities are focused on change at the bottom line, producing enough money for the Republican tax breaks today for well off Americans, not empowering families and compounding the serious deficit problems for tomorrow.

This proposition will abandon the policy track of the 1993 Democratic budget blueprint—which is exceeding its promise, a balanced Democrat 1993 budget package of tax fairness and reductions in spending, which would be a one trillion dollar deficit reduction in its seven year cycle—the Republicans may have the votes to hatch this ploy but beyond the tax breaks no stomach to carry out the plot.

I urge my colleagues today to reject the GOP scheme and get back to the real world of fiscal discipline, not political hyperbole.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this budget resolution.

I support a balanced budget amendment and am prepared to make the tough choices needed to stop the flow of red ink. But this budget is built on a faulty foundation and constructed with a tax break for the rich that we can not afford.

In the midst of a fiscal crisis is it responsible to give away \$245 billion in tax cuts? I do not think so. A tax break for the wealthy means less for everyone else. It means breaking our commitments to the American people. It says we no longer care about seniors who have built our country and we no longer care about educating our young people who will ensure our country's future.

Seniors must give up, get less, and pay more and college bound students must go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, we can reduce the deficit in a balanced and fair way—one that reduces spending while investing in our future.

My constituents care deeply about education, protection of our fragile environment, basic research, and fairness. They say cut and invest. This budget does neither and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a balanced budget. But I rise in

opposition to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996–2002.

Make no mistake. This bill reflects Republican priorities. It is a Republican budget that rewards the well-off and sticks the less-fortunate with the bill.

Republican conferees had an impossible task. Dress up a bill that hurts the elderly, the young, and the disadvantaged. Dress up a bill that guts Medicare and Medicaid, forces seniors to pay more out-of-pocket costs for health care, and devastates rural and inner-city hospitals. Dress up a bill that makes it more difficult for our children to go to college and get the education they deserve. Dress up a bill that lines the pockets of wealthy Americans.

It should come as no surprise that they failed. This bill was just too ugly to dress-up. But the American people do not need me to tell them how bad this budget plan is. Listen to your friends, your neighbors, and your family.

In my district, I listened to the Hopkins family. They're the real experts. The Hopkins have been married for 40 years. Mr. Hopkins works part-time at McDonalds, as he has for 6 years.

Every dollar counts. Although Mr. Hopkins worked for many years for a small business, he does not have a pension to rely on. Instead the Hopkins depend on Social Security, and Mr. Hopkins small supplemental income.

With \$490 a month going towards rent, the Hopkins have little left over to cover the cost of medical emergencies.

Under the Republican plan, the Hopkins will pay as much as \$2,000 a year more to cover cuts in Medicare. Although they fortunately have no co-payments right now, an increase of this size would be devastating.

The Hopkins are not a special case. They have worked hard all their lives. They have made the right choices, and they have sacrificed when we have asked.

Mrs. Hopkins has a heart condition. She has asthma. And arthritis. She pays for her own medicine—about \$200 a month. This cost represents a sizable percentage of their monthly income. After paying for rent, utilities, and food, they have almost nothing left over for clothes.

Mrs. Hopkins told me: "Leave our Medicare alone. We could not make it without Medicare. My last trip to the hospital just about broke us." A recent trip to the hospital dramatized the Hopkins' precarious position. Although the ambulance and hospital stay were paid for, Mrs. Hopkins was required to pay an additional \$130 for twenty pills.

While the Hopkins work to make ends meet, with dignity and strength, the Republican's have decided that it's fair to make life more difficult for families like this one. The Hopkins are right on the margin.

The Hopkins do not have any room to give. How can we ask them to sacrifice, and, at the same time, reward the wealthiest members of our society with a generous tax cut. Will the Hopkins benefit from this tax cut? No. The Hopkins will pay more and get less.

I can not support a budget plan that doesn't put hard-working Americans first—that does not put the Hopkins first.

I will support a fiscally responsible and sensible budget. The budget offered by my colleague, Mr. STENHOLM, was just such a budget. By proposing sensible reforms in health

care programs, and preserving crucial funding for education, rural health, research, and economic development programs, the Stenholm budget achieved a zero deficit without permanently crippling our society.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget. Do not let the American people down.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks. I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution because it makes massive cuts in Federal education and training programs. In addition, the Republicans are going to make it harder for children from middle class families to attend college—so it's easier for them to hand out tax cuts to the rich.

The Republican budget resolution reminds me of what Hall of Fame catcher Yogi Berra once said when he walked into a popular New York restaurant. He looked around the packed dining room and said: "No wonder no one comes here anymore, it's always crowded."

That about sums up the logic of the Republican about-face on its longtime support for Federal education programs, especially student financial aid. After discovering just how popular and successful the in-school interest subsidy has been the House Republicans proposed its complete elimination.

Their original proposal to cut student aid by \$18.7 billion was a foolish departure from the bipartisan, national policy to expand access to higher education that has existed since President Truman.

The conference agreement is hardly any better. Republicans will almost certainly have to eliminate the in-school interest subsidy for graduate and professional students.

More than 500,000 graduate students, all from needy families, will be affected by the loss of the subsidy. For some, Ph.D. students especially, the proposal will increase their loan payments by as much as \$375 per month and will increase total loan costs by \$45,000.

Despite what Republicans think, not every graduate student goes out and makes big bucks as a lawyer or stock broker. Many become teachers, ministers, social workers and, I might add, history professors, all of which are ordinarily not high-paying professions—unless, of course, they run for Congress, become Speaker and win a big, fat book contract.

The net result is that many young people who would have gone into these worthy professions will be forced to pursue higher-paying careers to be able to pay their loans back. That will mean more lawyers and fewer teachers. I guess this is what Republicans call progress.

Republicans still need to come up with another \$7 billion in student aid cuts to meet their budget target. They have not said how they will do it, but one thing is sure: Whatever they do will hurt students. The Republicans are going to make it harder for children from middle class families to attend college—so it's easier for them to hand out tax cuts to the rich.

The in-school interest subsidy helps tear down the financial barriers that would otherwise keep many deserving students from attending college and graduate programs. Moreover, taxpayers are paid back handsomely: college graduates earn higher incomes, and, consequently, pay higher taxes. Most graduate students who benefit from the subsidy will repay it in Federal income taxes within a few years.

For our society as a whole, the rate of return on this investment in education is overwhelming. Student aid has made our society more mobile, more prosperous, more stable, and, yes, more fair! Our economy is the strongest in the world, in large part, because our colleges have produced highly trained scientists, engineers, and managers.

In short, we are all better off, collectively and individually. Just ask Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader ARMEY, two former recipients of Federal student financial aid who went on to bigger and better things, due in no small part to the college education they received.

This debate, however, is about more than just economics. For generations a college degree has meant one thing: you have done everything possible to make sure your children have gotten off on the right foot in life. For parents and children alike, a college education has made dreams come true.

That is why the Democratic party has supported expanding access to higher education and why we believe that every person who wants to attend college and has the necessary intellectual capacity should attend college.

Finally, this budget should be defeated because of the massive cuts it makes in Federal education and training programs. President Clinton has correctly proposed massive increases in education and training spending—on the order of \$40 billion over 7 years. The Republicans will cut \$35 billion dollars.

Their cuts in the education and training account will reduce the real buying power of these programs by 33.2 percent in the year 2002. These cuts will have a devastating impact on a whole range of programs.

Republican budget cuts will harm efforts to assist local schools and communities working to improve their schools, raise their standards and increase parental involvement, to make schools safer and drug free, to provide students access to computers and technology in the classroom, to help limited English speaking children meet challenging academic standards, and to help schools meet needs of disadvantaged native American children.

Education is perhaps the most important investment we can make in a global economy. If America is to compete, our workers must be the best educated in the world. This country wants and needs a strong Federal role in education. I urge the defeat of this budget 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken, without intervening business, on adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 190, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—242

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

NOES—190

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

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

NOT VOTING—2

Moakley Reynolds

□ 1558

The previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] rise?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. 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 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—236

Allard	Ganske	Nethercutt
Archer	Gekas	Neumann
Armey	Geren	Ney
Bachus	Gilchrest	Norwood
Baker (CA)	Gillmor	Nussle
Baker (LA)	Gilman	Oxley
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Packard
Barr	Goodling	Parker
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Paxon
Bartlett	Graham	Petri
Barton	Greenwood	Pombo
Bass	Gunderson	Porter
Bateman	Gutknecht	Portman
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Pryce
Bilbray	Hamilton	Quillen
Billrakis	Hancock	Quinn
Bliley	Hansen	Radanovich
Blute	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Boehner	Hayworth	Riggs
Bonilla	Hefley	Roberts
Bono	Heineman	Rogers
Brownback	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burr	Hoke	Royce
Burton	Horn	Salmon
Callahan	Hostettler	Sanford
Calvert	Houghton	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Castle	Hyde	Schiff
Chabot	Inglis	Seastrand
Chambliss	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chrysler	Jones	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
Dreier	Linder	Thornberry
Duncan	Livingston	Tiahrt
Dunn	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Ehlers	Longley	Traficant
Ehrlich	Lucas	Upton
Emerson	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—191

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

Doggett Lantos
Dooley Levin
Doyle Lewis (GA)
Durbín Lincoln
Edwards Lipinski
Engel Lofgren
Eshoo Lowey
Evans Luther
Farr Maloney
Fattah Manton
Fazio Markey
Fields (LA) Martinez
Filner Mascara
Flake Matsui
Foglietta McCarthy
Ford McDermott
Frank (MA) McHale
Frost McKinney
Furse McNulty
Gejdenson Meehan
Gephardt Meek
Gonzalez Menendez
Gordon Mfume
Green Miller (CA)
Gutierrez Mineta
Hall (OH) Minge
Harman Mink
Hastings (FL) Mollohan
Hayes Montgomery
Hefner Moran
Hilliard Murtha
Hincheý Nadler
Holden Neal
Hoyer Oberstar
Jackson-Lee Obey
Jacobs Olver
Jefferson Ortiz
Johnson (SD) Owens
Johnson, E. B. Pallone
Johnston Pastor
Kanjorski Payne (NJ)
Kaptur Payne (VA)
Kennedy (MA) Pelosi
Kennedy (RI) Peterson (FL)
Kennelly Peterson (MN)
Kildee Pickett
Klecza Pomeroy
Klink Poshard
LaFalce Rahall

Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Tucker
Velazquez
Graham Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam

Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Longley
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam

Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Buyer Moakley Waxman
Dornan Orton
Gibbons Reynolds

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1616

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

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

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 194, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—239

Allard Boehner Chrysler
Archer Bonilla Clinger
Army Bono Coble
Bachus Brownback Coburn
Baker (CA) Bryant (TN)
Baker (LA) Bunn
Ballenger Bunning Condit
Barr Burr Cooley
Barrett (NE) Burton Cox
Bartlett Buyer Crane
Barton Callahan Crapo
Bass Calvert Cremeans
Bateman Camp Cubin
Bereuter Canady Cunningham
Bilbray Castle
Bilirakis Chabot Deal
Bliley Chambliss DeLay
Blute Chenoweth Diaz-Balart
Boehler Christensen Dickey

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

NAYS—194

de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)

Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hincheý
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez

NOT VOTING—2
Moakley Reynolds

□ 1629

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 310 AND H.R. 313

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 310 and H.R. 313.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 177) providing for the further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE, FOR ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES, FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVERY FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY, AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call