

not want to object to the gentleman's request, but I would request that we be given a little time to examine it. It is new to me. I would like to check it out. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his unanimous consent and let me have a couple of hours here to check it and renew it at a later point?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. This vote is going to be coming up early this afternoon, after 1:30. The objection last night was that this would somehow affect NGO's. We actually have talked to NGO's that are going into Sudan. They have said this would not have any impact on them whatsoever. But we wanted to just bend over backwards to make sure that everybody knew that humanitarian assistance was cleared.

Let me just say that after this passes, we will certainly be glad as we go to conference to do whatever it takes to make sure that the minority has no concerns regarding it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I do not have any doubt about the gentleman's intent here, but since I have only had a very few minutes to look at it, I still feel like I need some additional time to review it, so I would be constrained to object to the unanimous consent at this point. However, I would anticipate we could work this out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman agree to possibly, if I come back to amend it before the vote, when we come back in later today, would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. I understand there is a vote pending on the gentleman's amendment. I do not want to delay that. Let us proceed quickly here to find out about it. Then the gentleman can renew his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will be back in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 160

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the customary rule for considering a conference report on a budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, and against its consideration.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This 1 hour is instead of

the 5 hours called for under section 305(a) of the Budget Act. However, a review of the budget conference report rules over the last decade or so reveals that most of them provided for only 1 hour of debate, so this is customary, what we are doing here today.

Finally, the rule does not address the issue of a motion to recommit, since section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act states that a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order under the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a customary rule for the consideration of a budget resolution conference report.

Turning to the conference report itself, it is extremely important to recognize that this is a dramatic and a very positive shift in the direction of this country. This improvement is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of the Committee on the Budget. They and the other Members who worked with them deserve our commendation.

Our former colleague and leader, Bob Michel, used to say on this floor that "in political decision-making, we must never let the perfect become the enemy of the good." This sage advice I think applies here today.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget agreement is not perfect and it does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member of this House. In fact, I think that I can say with certainty that every Member of the House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making that decision.

I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had deeper spending cuts, much deeper. I would have had more tax cuts, more entitlement reform to get these entitlements under control, and certainly more spending for defense, which is really why this Congress exists, is to provide for a common defense for the 50 States against those that would take away our freedoms.

However, it is important to recognize once again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and in process. This principled compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. That is what this budget is all about.

Second, on balance it is a good budget. It is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts. These are specific changes that are being written into the law by the adoption of this budget, something radically different than the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and my colleagues all know that that did not work at all.