

to take away from American workers?" That is the reality of this visit that we just saw, the pathetic visit we just saw.

The answer of this House, and I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, as well as the leadership, for inserting in the bill that we are going to be discussing today, the answer of the American people and their representatives to the disgusting visit by the Cuban tyrant, is the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act. It is going to be passed again today, and it is the answer to this disgusting visit by the American people.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this request, but pending it, we would like our side to have one additional 1-minute, if that is all right with the gentleman on the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The Chair will recognize the gentleman for one 1-minute.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL AND CHILDREN

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage that, in the Republican rush to bestow a \$245 billion tax cut for America's wealthiest citizens, we are being asked to leave the futures of our children behind. This is nothing less than immoral.

While the wealthiest Americans will receive a \$20,000 windfall under the Republican budget, our Nation's abused and neglected children will suffer under a 19 percent cut in funding for programs offering child protection. By 2002, almost 200,000 children will be denied access to Head Start. Medicaid coverage for as many as 4.4 million children will be eliminated by 2002.

And the Republican budget denies 1 million women infant mortality assistance, affecting the births of 74,000 in-

fants each year, giving new meaning to the phrase, "women and children first."

Mr. Speaker, let us not throw our Nation's children overboard. Let us reject these immoral cuts, and oppose the Republican budget reconciliation bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109, SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST REFORM, AND FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for reform of the social security earnings limit, if called up by the majority leader or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. All time for general debate under the terms of the order of the House of October 24, 1995, shall be considered as expired. Further general debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2517, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment shall be in order except the further amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2530, which may be offered only by the minority leader or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the further amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a day, the Chair may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or

the majority leader or a designee of either. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee. The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered on the question of passage of the bill and on any conference report thereon. Clause 5(c) of rule XXI shall not apply to the bill, amendments thereof, or conference reports thereon.

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

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 245 is the customary restrictive rule for considering reconciliation legislation.

In this case the rule first makes in order the consideration in the House of a sense of the Congress resolution, House Congress Resolution 109, introduced by Mr. HASTERT. That resolution expresses the intent of Congress to pass legislation before the end of this year to raise the Social Security earnings limit for working seniors aged 65 through 69.

That is an important commitment we made in our Contract With America and we intend to keep that commitment to America's senior citizens.

Unfortunately, the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of legislation amending the Social Security Act as part of reconciliation. But we will vote on and pass this as a separate bill before this session adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, following 20 minutes of debate on that resolution, and a vote on its adoption, the rule provides for the further consideration of H.R. 2491, the Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995.

And, oh, how the title of this bill says it all—the "Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995." Today we are bringing to final fruition our efforts of the past 10 months to deliver to the American people on our promise to balance the budget in 7 years.

Yesterday, we had a full 3 hours of general debate on that bill pursuant to a unanimous-consent request that was granted in consultation with the minority leadership.

Today this rule provides for another 3 hours of general debate before we

consider for 1 hour a Democrat substitute that will be offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Those 6 hours are three times as much general debate time as we had on the Clinton reconciliation bill in 1993. That is as it should be, though, on a bill this important.

The rule provides for the adoption in the House and the Committee of the Whole of that amendment in the nature of a substitute which consists of the text of H.R. 2517, introduced by the Budget Committee chairman, as modified by the amendments printed in the Rules Committee's report on this rule.

That substitute is made base text for the purpose of further amendment. That further amendment is the so-called coalition substitute which is the text of H.R. 2530, introduced by Representative ORTON and others yesterday.

It will be debated for 1 hour. The House will then vote on it after which the Committee of the Whole will rise and report the bill back to the House.

Before final passage, the minority leader or a designee may offer one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. That is something that was denied us in the minority on reconciliation bills in recent years, but is something we guaranteed to the minority in our House rules reforms at the beginning of this Congress. So, the minority will have twice as many amendments as we were allowed when we were in the minority.

Finally, the rule orders the yeas and nays on passage of the bill, and suspends the application of clause 5(c) of rule XXI, which requires a three-fifths vote on any bill, amendment or conference report containing a Federal income tax rate increase, against the passage of the bill or the adoption of any amendment or conference report thereon.

Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to add that the Ways and Means Committee has certified that there are no Federal income tax rate increases contained in this measure we are making in order by this rule.

The three-fifths vote requirement is being waived, nevertheless, as a precautionary measure to avoid any unnecessary points that might be made out of a misunderstanding of the rule.

When we adopted this rule back on January 4 of this year, we placed an analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page H34. That analysis made clear that the term only applies to increases in the income tax rates contained in sections 1 and 11 of the Internal Revenue Code for individuals and corporations, respectively.

These are the commonly understood marginal or bracket rates with which most Americans are well familiar. That is the interpretation which still applies today. And this bill does not increase those rates one iota.

Mr. Speaker, today is not really about today's vote, as historic as it is, or about the past 10 months during which we struggled to develop this

glide-path to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Today is really about the future—the future of the economy, the future of this country, and the futures of our children and grandchildren and the better world we will bestow on them by putting our fiscal house in order today.

An overwhelming majority of the American people favor balancing the Federal budget—of ensuring that we spend no more than we take in. As the last election demonstrated, they fully expect us to make good our promises to balance the budget by making the hard choices necessary to achieve that goal.

Yes, it will involve some sacrifices on the part of everyone. But today's temporary pain will be tomorrow's great gain for our country as we build a strong economic base on which to create new jobs and prosperity for all Americans.

We can no longer be content to rest on the laurels of our past achievements. They are behind us and we are now literally drowning in a sea of red ink we have created by our past actions.

We have overpromised, overspent, and underdelivered on what the Government alone is capable of doing. In so doing, we have stifled rather than promoted individual initiative and opportunity in the private sector which is the key to new jobs and our future growth and survival as a country.

Our annual interest payments on the national debt alone are consuming and crowding out the capital necessary to build the kind of private sector growth that is so critical to our country's competing in this global economy.

By our actions here today we are recognizing the need to restrain the voracious appetite of the Government that is devouring the hard-earned dollars of American workers rather than allowing them to be put to more productive use in the private sector to create new and better paying jobs.

The time has come to put an end to the fiscal madness and insanity that is driving us deeper and deeper into debt. The bill before us reverses that trend.

It is called a reconciliation bill because in a narrow sense it reconciles our spending practices with our balanced budgetary goals adopted last spring.

But, in a larger sense it is a grander kind of reconciliation because it reconciles the grim realities of today with our hopes and dreams for a brighter and more prosperous future.

We cannot achieve that glorious reconciliation with the America we want to leave to our posterity if we do not make the hard choices and votes we must confront today. We can no longer get by on espousing the rhetoric of a balanced budget while avoiding taking the tough but necessary steps to get there.

We can no longer get by on blaming others for our failed dreams of balancing the budget when we have the duty and ability today by our votes on

this bill to make those dreams a reality.

Today, that dream is within our grasp—indeed, the vote is at our very fingertips. We can either vote "yes" for the dream of a brighter future, or "no" for a long nightmare of economic stagnation, failure, and collapse.

It's in our hands; the choice is ours. Support this rule and the balanced budget reconciliation bill it makes in order.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD information regarding this rule, and previous rules and other pertinent material:

H. RES 245—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF THE RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF: HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109—SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST REFORM; H.R. 2491—SEVEN YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

1. Provides for consideration in the House of a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) Social Security earnings test reform, debatable for 20 minutes, divided between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees.

2. Provides three hours of additional general debate on H.R. 2491, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

3. Provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2517 modified by the amendments printed in the Rules Committee's report on the rule shall be considered as adopted in the House and the Committee of the Whole; that the bill as amended shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment; and that all points of order against provisions of the bill as amended are waived.

4. Provides that no amendment shall be in order to the bill as amended except an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2530, which may only be offered by the Minority Leader or his designee.

5. Provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

6. Waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

7. Provides after a motion to rise has been rejected on any day, another such motion may only be offered by the Majority Leader or Budget Committee chairman.

8. Provides one motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.

9. Provides that the yeas and nays are ordered on final passage and that the provisions of clause 5(c) of Rule XXI (requiring a three-fifths vote on any amendment or measure containing a Federal income tax rate increase) shall not apply to the votes on the bill, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS MODIFYING THE TEXT OF H.R. 2517 TO FORM THE NEW BASE TEXT FOR AMENDMENT PURPOSES

Upton (MI): Amend Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to authorize the export of new drugs if approved in recipient country. (p. 275, after line 11, insert new Subtitle F—"FDA Export Reform and Enhancement Act")

Horn (CA)/Davis (VA) (modified): Add new tools for Federal agencies to collect debts

owed to the United States to enhance debt collection and improve financial management. (Inserts new Subtitle B to Title V, "Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1995," at page 333, line 15)

Barr (GA): Strike section 7002, "Civil Monetary Penalty Surcharge and Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Payments." (p. 416, line 3 through p. 419, line 6)

Davis (VA): Strike section 10404, "Collection of Parking Fees," requiring each Executive agency to collect parking fees at all Federal parking facilities. (p. 700, line 23 through page 701, line 19)

Davis (VA) (modified): Amend sec. 17201(c), National Technical Information Service, to provide that if an appropriate arrangement for the privatization of the functions of the NTI Service has not been made before the end of the 18-month period, the Service shall be transferred to the National Institute for Science and Technology. (p. 1588, lines 3 through 7)

Bliley (VA): Change the Medicaid allocation and lower the statutory caps for discretionary spending accordingly.

[Excerpted from the Rules Committee's report on H. Res. 245, the reconciliation rule] EXPLANATION AND DISCUSSION OF CLAUSE 5(C), RULE XXI WAIVER

As indicated in the preceding paragraph, the Committee has provided in this rule that the provisions of clause 5(c) of House Rule XXI, which require a three-fifths vote on any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report "carrying a Federal income tax rate increase," shall not apply to the

votes on passage of H.R. 2491, or to the votes any amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

The suspension of clause 5(c) of rule XXI is not being done because there are any Federal income tax rate increases contained in the reconciliation substitute being made in order as base text by this rule. As the Committee on Ways and Means has pointed out in its portion of the report on the reconciliation bill—

"The Committee has carefully reviewed the provisions of Titles XIII and XIV of the revenue reconciliation provisions approved by the Committee to determine whether any of these provisions constitute a Federal income tax rate increase within the meaning of the House Rules. It is the opinion of the Committee that there is no provision of Titles XIII and XIV of the revenue reconciliation provisions that constitutes a Federal income tax rate increase within the meaning of House Rule XXI, 5(c) or (d)."

Nevertheless, the Committee on Rules has suspended the application of clause 5(c) as a precautionary measure to avoid unnecessary points of order that might otherwise arise over confusion or misinterpretations of what is meant by an income tax rate increase.

Such a point of order was raised and overruled on the final passage vote of H.R. 1215, the omnibus tax bill, on April 15, 1995. The ranking minority member of the Rules Committee subsequently wrote to the chairman of this Committee requesting a clarification of the rule. An exchange of correspondence with the Parliamentarian and the Counsel of the Joint Tax Committee was subsequently

released by the chairman of this Committee on June 13, 1995, regarding the ruling and the provisions of the bill which gave rise to the point of order.

The Committee would simply conclude this discussion by citing from the section-by-section analysis of H. Res. 6, adopting House Rules for the 104th Congress, placed in the Congressional Record at the time the rules were adopted on January 4, 1995. With respect to clauses 5(c) and (d) which require a three-fifths vote on any income tax rate increase and prohibit consideration of any retroactive income tax rate increase, respectively:

"For purposes of these rules, the term 'Federal income tax rate increase' is, for example, an increase in the individual income tax rates established in section 1, and the corporate income tax rates established in section 11, respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986." (Congressional Record, Jan. 4, 1995, p. H-34)

The rates established by those sections are the commonly understood "marginal" tax rates or income "bracket" tax rates applicable to various minimum and maximum income dollar amounts for individuals and corporations. It is the intent of this committee that the term "Federal income tax rate increase" should be narrowly construed and confined to the rates specified in those two sections. As indicated in the Ways and Means Committee's report, those rates have not been increased by any provision contained in H.R. 2491 as made in order as base text by this resolution.

HOUSE RECONCILIATION RULES, 1980-93

Congress year	Bill No.	Rule	Terms of rules
96th (1980)	H.R. 7765	H. Res. 776	10-hours general debate (1-hr. ea. to 8 comms., 2-hrs. Ways and Means); 4 amendments allowed: (1) Budget Comm.; (2) Strike subtitle; (3) Rep. Vanik (D); (4) Rep. Bauman (R); one motion to recommit.
97th (1981)	H.R. 3982	H. Res. 169	8-hrs. general debate, comms. of juris.; amendment in nature of substitute by chairman of Budget Comm.; 6 amendments by Rep. Latta; 1-hr. on motion to recommit.
98th (1983)	H.R. 4169	H. Res. 344	1-hr. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; amendment in nature of substitute made in order; 1 amendment by chmn. Budget Comm.; one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.
98th (1984)	H.R. 5394	H. Res. 483	6-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; (1) amend. by W&M Comm., 1-hr; (2) amend. by Rep. Pepper, 30-mins.; one motion to recommit.
99th (1985)	H.R. 3500	H. Res. 296	4-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; self-execute amendment; (1) Rep. Fazio, 30-mins; (2) Rep. Latta, 1-hr.; (3) Rep. Florio, 30-mins; one motion to recommit.
99th (1986)	H.R. 5300	H. Res. 558	3-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; self-execute amend.; (1) Rep. Rodino, 30-mins.; (2) Rep. Rodino, 30-mins.; (3) Rep. Wylie, 30-mins.; one motion to recommit without instructions.
100th (1987)	H.R. 3545	H. Res. 296/298	3-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; self-execute amend.; (1) Rep. Michel, 1-hr.; one motion to recommit without instructions.
101st (1989)	H.R. 3299	H. Res. 245/249	6-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; self-execute amend.; 10 amendments (D-7-R-3), debatable from 30-mins. to 2-hrs. ea. (varies by amendment); one motion to recommit.
101st (1990)	H.R. 5835	H. Res. 509	3-hrs. gen. debate, Budget Comm.; self-execute amends.; (1) Rep. Rostenkowski, 1-hr.; one motion to recommit without instructions.
103d (1993)	H.R. 2264	H. Res. 186	2-hrs. gen. debate; self-execute amend. (54 page); (1) Rep. Kasich substitute, (290 pages), 1-hr.; one motion to recommit without instructions.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of October 25, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	51	70
Modified Closed ³	49	47	18	25
Closed ⁴	9	9	4	5
Total	104	100	73	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House Rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of October 25, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of October 25, 1995]

Table with columns: H. Res. No. (Date rept.), Rule type, Bill No., Subject, Disposition of rule. Lists various resolutions and their outcomes.

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

CORRECTION OF VOTES IN COMMITTEE REPORT OCTOBER 26, 1995

The Rules Committee's report, House Report 104-292 on House Resolution 245, the rule for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 109 and H.R. 2491, contains three erroneously reported rollcall votes due to typographical errors during the printing process. The votes were correctly reported in the original report filed with the Clerk.

Below is a correct version of those votes as contained in the Rules Committee report as filed with the House. The amendment numbers referred to in the motions are to amendments filed with the Rules Committee—a summary of which are contained following the listing of votes in the committee report.

The corrected votes for Rollcall Nos. 215, 228, and 229 are as follows:

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 215

Date: October 25, 1995.

Measure: House Concurrent Resolution 109, Sense of Congress on Social Security Earnings Test Reform, and H.R. 2491, The Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Motions No. 12, No. 13, and No. 35.

Results: Rejected, 5 to 8.

Rollcall table for No. 215 with columns: Vote by Member, Yea, Nay, Present. Lists members like QUILLEN, DREIER, GOSS, etc.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 228

Date: October 25, 1995.

Measure: House Concurrent Resolution, 109, Sense of Congress on Social Security Earnings Test Reform, and H.R. 2491, The Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: No. 30 and No. 38.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Rollcall table for No. 228 with columns: Vote by Member, Yea, Nay, Present. Lists members like QUILLEN, DREIER, GOSS, etc.

Rollcall table for No. 229 with columns: Vote by Member, Yea, Nay, Present. Lists members like WALDHOLTZ, MOAKLEY, etc.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 229

Date: October 25, 1995.

Measure: House Concurrent Resolution 109, Sense of Congress on Social Security Earnings Test Reform, and H.R. 2491, The Seven Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995.

Motion By: Mr. Frost.

Summary of Motion: No. 39.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 8.

Rollcall table for No. 229 with columns: Vote by Member, Yea, Nay, Present. Lists members like QUILLEN, DREIER, GOSS, etc.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1995.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,
Chairman of the Committee on Rules, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SOLOMON: Pursuant to authority provided to me by the Committee Report accompanying the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996, H. Con. Res. 67, I hereby certify the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by H. Res. 245 would result in a balanced budget by Fiscal Year 2002.

Section 210(a)(2)(C) of H. Con. Res. 67 authorized the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to certify an amendment in the nature of a substitute, made in order by the Committee on Rules, consisting of the text of the reported bill, as modified by any amendments necessary to balance the budget and achieve compliance with reconciliation instructions. Section 210(1) further specified that the certification is to be based upon an estimate provided by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

According to the attached estimate by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the substitute as amended by H. Res. 245 would result in the following deficit or surplus levels: \$-158 billion in Fiscal Year 1996, \$-180 billion in Fiscal Year 1997, \$-146 bil-

lion in Fiscal Year 1998, \$-120 billion in Fiscal Year 1999, \$-96 billion in Fiscal Year 2000, \$-40 billion in Fiscal Year 2001, and \$+1 billion in Fiscal Year 2002.

The consideration of H.R. 2491 is an historic step as Congress moves to balance the Federal budget for the first time in over 30 years. The future of our nation depends upon bringing our fiscal affairs in order. It has been an honor for me to participate in this exciting process.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1995.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2491, the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, considered as adopted under the terms of the rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 2491. As provided by section 210 of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67), CBO has projected the deficits that will result if the substitute is enacted. As specified in section 210, these

projections use the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution, assume the level of discretionary spending allowed under the new statutory caps on appropriations that are contained in the substitute, and include changes in outlays and revenues estimated to result from the economic impact of balancing the budget by fiscal year 2002 as estimated by CBO in its April 1995 "An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 1996." On that basis, CBO projects that enactment of the reconciliation legislation embodied in the substitute would produce a small budget surplus in 2002. The estimated federal spending, revenues and deficits that would occur if the proposal is enacted are shown in Table 1. The resulting differences from CBO's April 1995 baseline are summarized in Table 2, which includes the adjustments to the baseline assumed by the budget resolution. The estimated savings from changes in direct spending and revenues that would result from enactment of each title of the substitute are summarized in Table 3 and described in more detail in an attachment.

If you wish further details on this projection, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Attachment.

TABLE 1.—PROPOSED HOUSE OUTLAYS, REVENUES, AND DEFICITS
[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Outlays:							
Discretionary	536	525	518	517	521	517	516
Mandatory:							
Medicare ¹	194	209	217	228	247	266	288
Medicaid	97	103	108	112	117	122	127
Other	501	525	553	583	614	638	671
Subtotal	792	837	878	923	978	1,026	1,086
Net Interest	257	260	260	260	258	252	247
Total outlays	1,584	1,623	1,656	1,700	1,758	1,795	1,849
Revenues	1,426	1,442	1,510	1,580	1,662	1,755	1,849
Deficit	158	180	146	120	96	40	-1

¹ Medicare benefit payments only. Excludes medicare premiums and graduate medical education spending.

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Notes.—The fiscal dividend expected to result from balancing the budget is reflected in these figures. Numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 2.—PROPOSED HOUSE BUDGETARY CHANGES FROM CBO'S APRIL BASELINE
[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total 1996-2002
CBO April baseline deficit ¹	210	230	232	266	299	316	349	NA
Baseline adjustments ² :								
CPI rebenchmarking ³	0	0	0	-1	-3	-6	-9	-18
Other adjustments ⁴	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	10
Subtotal	1	1	1	1	-1	-4	-8	-9
Policy Changes:								
Outlays, discretionary:								
Freeze ⁵	-8	-9	-12	-35	-55	-75	-96	-289
Additional savings	-10	-22	-29	-26	-22	-26	-28	-162
Welfare reform ⁶	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	19
Subtotal	-16	-28	-38	-58	-74	-98	-120	-432
Outlays, mandatory:								
Medicare	-8	-15	-27	-40	-49	-60	-71	-270
Medicaid	-3	-7	-14	-23	-31	-41	-51	-169
Other	-14	-22	-22	-27	-29	-29	-31	-174
Subtotal	-25	-44	-63	-89	-109	-130	-153	-614
Net Interest	-2	-5	-9	-16	-27	-41	-60	-161
Total outlays	-42	-77	-111	-164	-210	-269	-333	-1,207
Revenues ⁷	-8	33	38	40	39	39	41	223
Total policy changes	-50	-44	-73	-124	-171	-231	-292	-985
Adjustment for fiscal dividend ⁸	-3	-7	-14	-23	-32	-41	-50	-170
Total adjustments and policy changes	-52	-50	-86	-146	-204	-276	-350	-1,163
House policy deficit	158	180	146	120	96	40	-1	NA

¹ Projections assume that discretionary spending is equal to the spending limits that are in effect through 1998 and will increase with inflation after 1998.

² The budget resolution was based on CBO's April 1995 baseline projections of mandatory spending and revenues, except for a limited number of adjustments.

³ The budget resolution baseline assumed that the 1998 rebenchmarking of the CPI by the Bureau of Labor Statistics will result in a 0.2 percentage point reduction in the CPI compared with CBO's December 1994 economic projections.

⁴ The budget resolution baseline made adjustments related to revised accounting of direct student loan costs, expiration of excise taxes dedicated to the Superfund trust fund as provided under current law, the effects of enacted legislation, and technical corrections.

⁵ Savings from freezing 1996-2002 appropriations at the nominal level appropriated for 1995.

⁶ Increases in statutory caps on discretionary spending to reflect shifts from mandatory spending to discretionary spending embodied in welfare reform provisions included in reconciliation bills. The cap adjustments are specified in Title XX of the bill.

⁷ Revenue increases are shown with a negative sign because they reduce the deficit.

⁸ CBO has estimated that balancing the budget by 2002 would result in lower interest rates and slightly higher real growth that could lower federal interest payments and increase revenues by \$170 billion over the fiscal year 1996-2002 period. See Appendix B of CBO's April 1995 report. "An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 1996."

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Notes.—NA=not applicable; CPI=consumer price index. Numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 3.—HOUSE RECONCILIATION MANDATORY SPENDING AND REVENUE CHANGES BY TITLE

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

Title	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1996–2002
I—Agriculture:								
Outlays	-0.9	-1.9	-1.9	-1.9	-1.9	-2.5	-2.5	-13.3
II—Banking and Financial Services:								
Outlays	-6.4	(¹)	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	-5.3
Revenues ²	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Deficit	-6.4	(¹)	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	-5.3
III—Commerce:								
Outlays	-0.3	-2.9	-2.7	-4.0	-3.7	-3.2	-1.9	-18.7
IV—Economic and Educational Opportunities:								
Outlays	-1.4	-1.1	-1.3	-1.5	-1.6	-1.7	-1.7	-10.2
V—Government Reform and Oversight:								
Outlays	-0.6	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-0.9	-6.5
Revenues ²	-0.2	-0.4	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.7	-3.7
Deficit	-0.8	-1.4	-1.6	-1.6	-1.6	-1.6	-1.6	-10.2
VI—International Relations:								
Outlays	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	-0.1
VII—Judiciary:								
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.5
VIII—National Security:								
Outlays	0.4	-0.6	1.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	2.1
IX—Resources:								
Outlays	-0.1	-0.9	-0.2	-0.1	-0.6	-0.1	-0.1	-2.1
Revenues ²	0.0	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Deficit	-0.1	-0.9	-0.2	-0.1	-0.6	-0.1	-0.1	-2.1
X—Transportation and Infrastructure:								
Outlays	(¹)	-0.1	(¹)	-0.6	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.8
XI—Veterans' Affairs:								
Outlays	-0.3	-0.3	-0.5	-1.2	-1.4	-1.3	-1.4	-6.4
XII—Ways and Means Trade:								
Outlays	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(¹)
Revenues ²	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
XIII—Ways and Means Revenues:								
Outlays	-0.1	-2.6	-2.8	-2.9	-3.1	-3.2	-3.3	-18.0
Revenues ²	-0.6	-1.4	-3.1	-4.0	-4.5	-5.1	-6.1	-24.9
Deficit	-0.8	-4.1	-5.9	-6.9	-7.5	-8.3	-9.4	-42.9
XIV—Ways and Means Tax Simplification:								
Revenues ²	0.2	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	4.7
XV—Medicare:								
Outlays:								
Medicare	-7.9	-15.1	-26.9	-39.9	-49.2	-59.9	-71.3	-270.2
Graduate medical education	0.0	1.3	1.5	2.3	3.1	3.6	4.0	15.8
Subtotal	-7.9	-13.8	-25.4	-37.6	-46.1	-56.3	-67.3	-254.4
XVI—Transformation of Medicaid:								
Outlays	-2.7	-6.9	-14.3	-22.6	-31.2	-40.8	-50.9	-169.5
XVII—Abolishment of Department of Commerce:								
Outlays	0.0	(¹)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(¹)
XVIII—Welfare reform:								
Outlays	-4.3	-13.4	-16.2	-18.4	-21.0	-22.1	25.2	120.6
XIX—Contract with America Tax Cut:								
Revenues ²	-7.8	34.1	40.3	44.3	43.6	43.8	47.2	245.7
XX—Budget Process:								
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Totals:								
Outlays	-24.7	-45.6	-64.8	-91.2	-111.1	-131.9	-155.0	-624.4
Revenues ²	-7.9	33.3	37.6	40.4	39.3	38.8	41.3	222.7
Deficit	-32.7	-12.3	-27.2	-50.8	-71.8	-93.1	-113.7	-401.7
Interactive effects:								
Outlays	0.1	1.4	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	10.6
Totals:								
Outlays	-24.7	-44.2	-63.2	-89.5	-109.2	-130.0	-153.0	-613.8
Revenues	-7.9	33.3	37.6	40.4	39.3	38.8	41.3	222.7
Deficit	-32.6	-11.0	-25.6	-49.1	-69.9	-91.2	-111.7	-391.1

¹ Less than \$50 million.

² Revenue increases are shown with a negative sign because they reduce the deficit.

Note.—Numbers may not add to totals because of rounding.

Sources.—Congressional Budget Office; Joint Committee on Taxation.

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

□ 0945

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the customary 30 minutes of debate time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose the rule, and the legislation it makes in order—the budget reconciliation bill drafted by the Republican leadership.

The importance of the legislation before us cannot be overstated. It is a measure that makes drastic changes in a huge number of Federal programs and services; a measure that will directly affect virtually every American. Yet the rule for its consideration allows the House to consider only one substitute, and one motion to recommend. And, the rule limits the remaining time for general debate to just 3 hours, plus 1 hour for debate on the substitute.

It is true, as our friends on the other side of the aisle have pointed out, that this is a typical rule for a budget reconciliation bill. But this is not a typical reconciliation bill; it is not a bill that has been developed through the normal reconciliation process but, rather, one that has been brought to the House floor through actions of the Republican leadership that constitute an extremely serious abuse of the legislative process.

In years past, reconciliation bills were drafted in open committee meetings. When committees acted on their reconciliation instructions, Members of both parties had the opportunity to debate the issues and offer amendments. After committees acted, the Budget Committee reviewed and reported the final bill, and after that, the Rules Committee issued a rule for its consideration. All this was done in full view of the press and the public. In other words, reconciliation bills were the products of an open, democratic, deliberative, and accountable process.

We knew what the bills contained, and who had agreed to the provisions in them.

The bill before us now, however, contains critical changes in agriculture programs, in the civil service retirement system, in tax policy, in the structure of a Federal department, and other important provisions that were not considered by the committees of jurisdiction, nor reviewed by the Budget Committee. Some of the provisions were not even finalized until last night.

These portions of the bill were drafted behind the closed doors of the Speaker's office, where decisions were also made to drop certain provisions from the committee reported version of the bill. Even as the Rules Committee was conducting its hearing yesterday—and even as general debate on the bill had begun on the floor—decisions were still being made by the Republican leadership about the contents of the plan we would be asked to vote on today.

We find the disregard for the normal legislative process that has been demonstrated by this process profoundly disturbing. We believe it is a huge injustice to the Members of the House and, far more important, to the people we represent.

And we, the Democratic minority, are not alone in our view of what is happening here. A recent editorial in *Roll Call* described what is going on by saying:

Speaker Newt Gingrich is indisputably providing strong direction for the House, but in the process he and his hand-picked leadership are running roughshod over the congressional committee system and depriving minority Democrats, rank-and-file Republicans, and even committee chairmen of the power to shape legislation. The question arises: Is this democracy or rule by politburo?

That's not a Democratic sympathizer speaking; that's a newspaper that was equally, if not more, critical of the way the Democratic Party ran the House.

The point is, the bill before us did not arrive through the typical process, and therefore the highly restrictive rule for its consideration cannot be justified on the basis of the restrictive rules used for reconciliation bills in the past. At the very least, the rule for this particular reconciliation bill should provide the House with the opportunity to consider amendments to those sections of the bill that were drafted outside of the normal committee process.

We also object to the rule's waiver of clause 5(c) of rule XXI, which requires a three-fifths vote for any bill which contains a Federal income tax rate increase. That rule, as Members recall, was adopted at the beginning of this Congress to make it more difficult to pass an income tax rate increase.

We believe that the Republican reconciliation bill would raise income taxes on 8 million American working families because of the bill's change in the earned income tax credit. Members on the other side of the aisle have tried to assure us that, no, this bill does not raise income taxes. If that, in fact, is the case, we see no reason for the protection this rule provides against the three-fifths vote requirement for a bill that raises income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, of even greater concern to us than the procedural abuse we have seen in this year's reconciliation process is the actual legislation that process has produced.

Many of us applaud the fact that the Republican leadership set a goal of 7 years for bringing the Federal budget into balance. But we think that this particular plan reaches that goal the wrong way, and that the Republican leadership is misleading the American people by justifying the drastic spending cuts in their plan as necessary to reach a balanced budget. The fact is, it is not necessary to make such extreme spending cuts in order to balance the budget, and that will be clearly demonstrated by the Stenholm-Orton-Peterson plan that will be offered as an alternative to the Republican plan.

Furthermore, contrary to the rhetoric surrounding the Republican plan, the greatest significance of this measure is not its role in producing a balanced budget. Of far greater consequence is the fact that it will result in a monumental shift of resources from poor and middle-income Americans to the wealthiest Americans. It is a cruel, mean-spirited, and misguided measure that will reward well-to-do Americans and special interests, and punish the poor.

What else but cruel can you consider a measure that provides a tax credit worth several hundred dollars per child for families earning \$200,000, but not for families earning \$20,000? That cuts taxes for the top 1 percent of earners by an average of \$14,000, while raising taxes for millions of working families? What is fair about requiring hard-working, but low-wage American workers to foot the bill for a tax cut for doctors and lawyers and corporate executives and—yes—Members of Congress?

What else but mean-spirited can you consider a bill that pulls the rug out from under working families by cutting not only the earned income tax credit, but also Medicaid, food stamps, child care assistance—the support that parents working in low-wage jobs need to stay off welfare?

What else but misguided can you consider a bill that raises the cost of student loans—the primary means available to moderate-income families to give their children a leg up in life? A bill that jeopardizes the retirement security of millions of working Americans by allowing corporations to raid workers' pension funds? And yet, at the same time, abolishes the alternative minimum tax that ensures that profitable corporations are not able to use multiple tax loopholes to escape paying taxes?

What else but wrongheaded can you consider a bill that provides special deals for industries that want to use the natural resources that belong to all Americans—giveaways of Federal resources for mining, timber, ranching, and oil and gas interests? And special deals for concessionaires in our national parks, and for ski operators in our national forests?

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, for a terrible bill. I urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the bill.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], one of the Members of this House who has done more to bring about some fiscal sanity than others that I know and is a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding

me this time. I did want to underscore some of the points that he made in his excellent opening remarks.

This truly is a momentous day and certainly one of the most noteworthy in my short tenure as a member of this body. Before the sun sets today, we actually are going to pass a 7-year balanced budget plan that wipes out our national deficits and allows us to begin the process of paying down our enormous Federal debt. That is a major accomplishment and major good news for America.

We will deliver this product to the American people, because it is the right thing to do and because they have asked us to do it. No doubt we will continue to hear the words of doom, gloom, and fear from those on the other side who are still imprisoned in the status quo. Given the dire predictions and the red hot rhetoric we have already heard from the naysayers, some people might conclude that this is just about cuts, that we are gutting all that is great and good about America, instead of what we are really doing, which is excising layers of government fat that have grown up over the past 40 years.

In fact, it may surprise people to know that Federal spending under this proposal is actually slated to grow, I said grow, significantly in each of the 7 years ahead. In fact, this plan starts with an annual Federal spending program of \$1.5 trillion and ends with an annual spending program that is a full \$300 billion more than that. Yet in that 7th year, 2002, we will have also balanced the budget.

Now, how do we do that? It is possible because we are allowing our economy to grow. We are creating jobs, opportunities for Americans to work, opportunities to expand our economy, while at the same time we control the cancerous growth of rampant, runaway Federal spending which so many have closed their eyes to for so long.

Two years ago I stood in staunch opposition to President Clinton's budget reconciliation bill, the largest tax hike in history. Three years before that I opposed the deal worked out between President Bush and congressional Democrats. Both of these budgets had two basic flaws. They allowed for continued deficits as far as the eye could see, and they raised taxes at a time when we should have been addressing our chronic spending problem.

This year is different. We are eliminating redundant and wasteful spending. We are preserving and strengthening our vital health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid. We are reforming welfare, and we are allowing all Americans to keep more of what they earn by lowering taxes. It is their money, not Washington's.

Mr. Speaker, as one would expect, given a change of this magnitude, there have been disagreements on individual items within the package. Indeed,

there are several elements of this bill that remain troubling to me, but I have concluded that the fundamental and overriding interest of balancing the Federal books while unshackling the American people from the grip of excessive Federal Government far outweighs the drawbacks of certain of the items. In fact, Washington does not know it all.

Mr. Speaker, with all the rhetoric surrounding this debate, I recall the words of President Theodore Roosevelt who said, "Aggressive fighting for the right is the noblest sport the world affords." We are today engaged in such a noble sport. We are preserving the integrity of the U.S. Government and the viability of America for our children, our grandchildren, our parents, and ourselves. I am proud of that effort, and I obviously support this rule to get us started along this 7-year path to balance the budget.

Notwithstanding the points from my good friend and colleague from California, Mr. BEILENSON, about management procedures, I believe that this is a fair rule and an appropriate rule for the reconciliation budget process, and I certainly think it is fairer than the one we saw in the previous year. I urge support for the rule and support for the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], our distinguished friend and the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, The more I look at this bill, the more horrified I become.

This bill is an enormous collection of heartless attacks on American children, senior citizens, and working families.

And the worst part, the most disappointing aspect of this whole horrible collection of mean-spirited cuts—is that they are made in order to lower taxes for the very, very rich.

Mr. Speaker, that is not why we were sent to Congress.

We were not sent here to cut \$270 billion from Medicare on which 40 million seniors rely; We were not sent here to cut \$182 billion from Medicaid, a program 4.4 million American children desperately need but will not get.

We were not sent here to cut \$54 million from energy assistance for working families. And we certainly were not sent here to do all of that, in order to parcel out goodies to the very rich.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is too outrageous to believe but it is true without these Medicare cuts, this supposedly balanced budget has an \$82 billion deficit.

Last week's Medicare vote and this vote are the same thing. Any one of my colleagues who votes for this bill is voting to put the squeeze on grandmothers, grandfathers, children, and working families, in order to give a tax break to the very rich.

This is an outrageous excuse for a bill and if it becomes law, it will mean some very dark days for many Americans.

This bill, takes from the mouths of babes, from the health care of seniors, from the education of students, and gives straight to the pockets of the rich.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

□ 1000

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE], a new member of the Committee on Rules this year who brought wisdom and common sense to our Committee on Rules and our Congress, a former judge from Columbus, OH.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this rule. Once again, this House faces an historic opportunity to choose between the policies of the status quo or to chart a bold new path for the future.

The Democrats argue that we are going too far too fast. Yet many on our side of the aisle believe we have not gone nearly far enough. The truth is the Republican Congress has worked long and hard to bring us to this moment in time when we are about to pass legislation to end years of rapidly expanding Government and to start this pendulum swinging the other way. Very simply, the bill before us will shift the focus of Government from quantity to quality and from spending to service.

Mr. Speaker, our national debt is nearly \$5 trillion. It is very hard for mere mortals to comprehend \$5 trillion. So here is an example paraphrased from the Wall Street Journal that can help us understand. Let us say Congress will try to pay the \$5 trillion national debt by putting \$1 every second into a special account. If 1 million seconds adds up to 12 days, then 1 billion seconds is roughly 32 years. And 1 trillion seconds is nearly 32,000 years.

In order to pay off the debt, Congress would have to deposit \$1 into the account every second for the next 160,000 years. That is more time than the amount of time that has passed since the Ice Age.

As our author of this legislation, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] told the Committee on Rules yesterday, if you had a business which lost a million dollars a day since the time that Christ walked on this earth, your business still would be far better off than this country is now.

Mr. Speaker, we have to get this under control. Lately many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have accused Republicans of being heartless, saying our budget is an attack on children. Yet a child born today will have to pay \$187,000 in his or her lifetime just to pay the interest on this national debt.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is so compassionate about spending money we simply do not have and then sad-

dling our children and grandchildren with this enormous debt? Is it compassionate to condemn our children to a lower standard of living than we enjoy? The answer is clearly no. Further, it simply is arrogant to believe that Washington has a monopoly on compassion, that only Federal solutions can address problems on the State and local level.

Our plan, Mr. Speaker, suggests that there is more compassion at the level of local government with our Governors, with our mayors, with our city councils than there is in nameless, faceless Federal bureaucrats.

In closing, let me say that House Resolution 245 is a responsible rule. I urge my colleagues to adopt it and the underlying legislation so that we can begin to swing the pendulum back to an era of growth, productivity and financial security for our children and for future generations.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, when the budget resolution upon which today's bill is being based was considered by this body, I stood in this very spot to challenge it based on House rule XXI, which requires a three-fifths vote of the House in order to increase taxes, a measure that was supported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and a rule that I wholeheartedly supported as a freshman on my first day here.

Speaker GINGRICH ruled me out of order by saying that the budget was a resolution, not a bill. He advised me to study the rules. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have studied the rules. I find that the issue before us today is a bill, and it should have this rule applied to it. But now I am told that after midnight, last night, today's debate was arranged in such a way that, although Speaker GINGRICH said on January 4 that no tax increase would take place without a three-fifths majority, that this bill would be exempt from that rule. If it is a tax increase, it should require a three-fifths majority; and, if the rule is being waived today, it must be a tax increase.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, our Republican budget chairman is correct. The pendulum of power has swung. It has swung smack-dab into the faces of American seniors, smack-dab into the faces of students trying to get a full education and into the faces of working Americans who want to claim a share of the American dream.

They give us a new sick tax for the old. They raise new barriers to education for the young and more taxes on working Americans. That is why we call this Republican bill wreckonconciliation; it is a wreck for working American families.

Of course, they spell it different. They leave off the W. They call it reconciliation, like after a divorce. But you know, they are still so divorced from reality in America, the reality of what it is to work hard, to try to make ends meet for a family, the reality of what it is to survive on a Social Security check and rely on America, so divorced from a reality that their spokesman, our Republican colleague from North Carolina, thinks \$183,000 is lower middle class.

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

Mr. Speaker, I sit here in amazement when I listen to this. We are supposed to be responsible people. When you look at what we are doing with this budget, my colleagues, we are not cutting WIC. We are not cutting Head Start. We are not cutting Green Thumb. We are not cutting the RSV programs which are such good programs. We are not cutting school lunch programs.

Let me tell Members what we are doing. We are reconstructing this Federal Government. Do Members know how we are doing it? We are doing it the same way that business and industry are forced to do it in order to survive, to make a profit.

I want Members to listen to some of these words because if they read these bills here, this is what this contains. This does not contain cuts for the truly needy. My colleagues will not hear me mention one word about it.

This is what we are doing. We are merging. Ever hear that word before? We are consolidating. We are eliminating. We are privatizing. We are defunding, and we are outright abolishing dozens of antiquated, duplicative, and unnecessary bureaus, agencies, administrations, offices, commissions, and for the first time whole departments.

Do my colleagues know who is squealing like stuck pigs? It is the bureaucrats inside Washington, the taxers, the spenders, the regulators. These are the people that are being cut, and we are going to balance this budget no matter what because what is compassionate about piling this kind of irresponsible debt on our children and our grandchildren?

Mr. Speaker, you have grandchildren. I have four of them now. We are going to have some fiscal sanity in this body starting here today. This bill is going to pass with overwhelming support in this body, and we will bring about fiscal sanity.

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

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, after all the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has said about merging and acquisition and all that, they are cutting. They are not only cutting; they are gutting.

Balancing the budget is about balancing sacrifice. There is no balance of

sacrifice here. People get to keep their own money, I hear. Let me tell you who is keeping their own money. Earn over \$100,000 a year, you are about 1 percent of the population, you get to keep \$2,400. Earn \$350,000, you get to keep \$14,000.

If you are in West Virginia and you are one of the 85 percent of our State that earns less than \$50,000, you will pay \$530 more out of pocket either in increased taxes or lost program benefits such as student loans and Medicare. Why is it that Medicare has to be cut \$270 billion, when the Medicare trustees themselves, the stewards of the fund, say only \$90 billion is sufficient? The reason is for a tax cut, a tax cut that goes to the wealthiest individuals in this country.

We are talking about balancing budgets. But we are not talking here about balancing sacrifice. West Virginians say we all know we have to come to the table. We all know we have to give something. But when 85 percent of the people are having to give directly out of their pockets, directly out of their middle class and middle income abilities to make sure that those over \$100,000 are able to keep far more of their money, that is not balanced sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, we must, oppose this resolution and this bill. This is about tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals, not about balancing budgets.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a moment to point out that the previous speaker who opposes tax relief in this bill opposes tax relief for 155,000 working families in his home State of West Virginia, including 13,392 families who would have their entire Federal income tax burden eliminated by the budget bill that he opposes today.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader does not point out that he raises taxes on 70,000 working lower income West Virginians, those under \$24,000 a year. He does not point out that the tax bill he supported 2 years ago would have greatly given the wealthiest a tax break while the lowest income West Virginians would have received a tax increase. He does not point out that he is taking money out of 300,000 senior West Virginians, 400,000 of those on Medicaid, 700,000 total.

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

Mr. WISE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, nor does he point out that every Texas grandmother and young child is worth half as much as one in New York under his bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker. I rise to reluctantly oppose the rule. I am reluctant because at least we will have an opportunity to present the coalition budget. But I oppose the rule because we only get 30 minutes to explain it, which simply is not enough. So let me take 45 minutes to point out one change in our budget.

We assume a change in the Consumer Price Index. The Consumer Price Index is an assumption, an economic assumption. Virtually all of the economists, including Alan Greenspan, have indicated that the CPI formula overstates inflation by up to a percentage point. Ours is not the only budget to make this assumption or make this change. In the Republican budget originally there was a six-tenths of a percentage change. There is now a two-tenths of a percentage change.

Let me simply say, I hope that we can really debate issues and we will not be attacked as raising taxes or cutting Social Security as a result of this. We have got virtually all of the Republicans on record who spoke in the debate of the original resolution saying that this is not any such tax increase. It is simply an economic formula change. I hope we will not get into that.

The Speaker has indicated that he in fact would support such a change if the President would, but somebody has got to step forward and propose it. We are doing that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker. I yield 1 minute to our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the words of the great movie "Cool Hand Luke," what we have here is a failure to communicate.

We have Republicans accusing Democrats of being stuck in the old FDR policies, but the truth of the matter is, it is the Republicans that are stuck in the FDR era. Anybody that has benefited in any way from Government spending is the target of their cuts.

They go about providing a phenomenal tax cut to the richest people in this country, providing literally \$20,000 a year to people with incomes above \$350,000 and, at the same time, go about raising taxes on the some of the poorest people and the working families of this country. They cut off student loans. They go after the nursing home standards. They go after a \$450 billion cut on Medicare and the Medicaid and senior citizens of this country.

Why not ask everybody to participate? Why increase the defense spending this year? Why provide a tax cut to the wealthiest people in the country? Why not ask corporate America to participate instead of lavishing on corporate American additional tax bennies? Why not ask us to stand up to Gallo Wine, to stand up to McDonald's hamburgers, to stand up to the mining

industry, the lumber industry, and all of the industries that have so many benefits that are sprinkled throughout this bill?

Let us come up with a balanced budget but let us do it with equity and equanimity in terms of this country's policies.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker. I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] a member of the Committee on Rules from Claremont, CA.

□ 1015

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the 30 seconds from the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman, and I do so to simply point out that my very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who appears to have left the floor here, opposes tax relief to 656,736 working families in his State of Massachusetts including 77,225 families who would have their entire Federal tax burden eliminated under the budget bill that he is opposing today, and I think it is a sad commentary.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to tell the truth, and I appreciate the gentleman from California, my Republican colleague's unwavering support of \$270 billion in Medicare cuts, but I am not sure if he realizes that 1,200 families in his district will be cut off the earned income tax credit and will be paying more taxes or not getting the benefit of the earned income tax credit by this budget reconciliation proposal.

Since, I have come this morning to the part of the truth squad, I know my Republican colleagues realize what the Budget Reconciliation Act means to Americans. It means they are going to be locked up and hauled off to jail as this picture reflects of a senior citizen in handcuffs taken away from the one Republican held hearing on Medicare. That is what happened in the U.S. Congress when someone came, an elderly citizen, to protest the Medicare cuts. The truth should be told on how severe these cuts will be on seniors, working families, children, and our youth.

We do not have a budget deficit problem which has been misrepresented by the Republican majority. What we have is a U.S. budget deficit that has fallen for the last three years. From a high of almost \$300 billion to much lower and it is going down every year. We have the best economy in the Western World. Other nations, like Japan and Germany, are wondering how we do it. We have the lowest unemployment, but, as my colleagues know, what we need in America is for working men and women, to have higher incomes, we need to make sure Medicare is in place and we certainly do not need \$270 bil-

lion in tax cuts, eliminating student loans and health care for our children. We need student loans for our children. We need health care through Medicare and Medicaid. This budget can be balanced with cuts that do not hurt working men and women.

This is what is happening to the American people. Stop the untruths, this debate today should be on how this budget should be for America not against America.

My Speaker, I add quotes from the following article for the RECORD:

U.S. BUDGET DEFICIT FALLS FOR 3D YEAR

(By John M. Berry)

The deficit hit a record \$290 billion in fiscal 1992 before dropping to \$255 billion in 1993 and \$203 billion in 1994. Strong economic growth as well as the spending cuts and tax increases in Clinton's 1993 legislation have been responsible for bringing the deficit to its lowest level since 1989.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman, once again for being extraordinarily generous with his time, and I would like to simply point out that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], my friend, in opposing this bill is opposing tax relief to 2,016,767 Texans including 285,572 hard-working Texans who will be taken completely off the Federal income tax roll, and it is a very sad commentary on the representation made.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for his dutiful comment on my representation. Let say to him that I am proud of my representation because I know that the people in Texas will lose \$24 million in Medicare over 7 years by this cut. Texas will see over 200,000 children lose medicaid coverage. Many of our Texas students who get student loans will also not get those student loans. Local health services for those using the Harris County Hospital District and those in need of mental health services being lost! And let me tell my Republican colleagues it is more important for me to stand for my constituents. They will be hurt by this budget reconciliation bill. This is an absolute travesty.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that in the gentleman from California's district 22,750 taxpayers will see their taxes increased under this proposal.

Basically what we are seeing here are huge cuts in Medicare/Medicaid and other programs for middle-income Americans and low-income Americans in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. I wanted to just talk briefly about those low-income seniors, mostly windows, which were discussed last

week on the Medicare bill, and how they are going to be negatively impacted by this Medicaid bill and the refusal of the committee on Rules to include a provision, an amendment, today that would have protected them.

Right now those seniors who are eligible for Medicaid have Medicaid pay for their part B premium under Medicare which means that that \$46 per month, which will go up to and double under the Republican proposal to almost \$90 per month that these low-income seniors have to pay in order to get their part B Medicare premium, that pays for their doctor's bill. Right now that is paid for by Medicaid, but this bill would eliminate that guarantee for those people, for those millions of widows and other low-income seniors, who right now have their doctor bills and their doctor benefits paid for by Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I went before the Committee on Rules yesterday, and I asked that that amendment be considered that would provide that guarantee, and we were denied that even though last week on the floor of this House at the conclusion of the Medicare debate the Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, said that this legislation was going to provide that guarantee for those widows and for those low-income seniors. Mr. Speaker, I want all my colleagues to know that there is no guarantee in this bill for those individuals, particularly those widows. The Speaker said that he was going to provide the guarantee. There is no guarantee. When we went before the Committee On Rules and asked that that be placed in order today, we were told, no, it would not be considered.

I think it is really terrible that in a context where it is suggested and it is being implemented that all these major tax cuts for wealthy Americans and those low-income seniors will not have their physician's bills paid under this legislation.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today's historic vote will have a profound impact on the people we were sent here to represent. As the debate draws to a close, Members must stand and be counted on a fundamental question, will we provide lavish tax breaks for wealthy people and for multinational corporations or will we protect Medicare for America's seniors. The Gingrich plan that the House will vote on today is a shameful payoff for the rich and well-connected special interests paid for by a \$270 billion raid on Medicare, and the American people know it.

Thirty years ago another Congress took another historic vote to create a health care system for our Nation's seniors. Not a single Republican voted for that creation of Medicare, including the majority leader of the other body, and yesterday he bragged of that

vote saying that we knew it would not work.

On this side of the street Speaker GINGRICH joined the trashing of Medicare, and on Tuesday he revealed the real GOP plan to destroy Medicare. Speaker GINGRICH said that we did not get rid of it in the first round because we do not think that that is politically smart, and he further said that we believe that it will, Medicare will, wither on the vine.

Mr. Speaker, those comments to that extent are sour grapes for seniors in this country.

Today Republicans are closing in on their 30-year goal to end Medicare, but while Republican leaders say that Medicare does not work, America's seniors know that it does work, and for 30 years it has worked. It has stood for generations as a sacred compact between our Government and our seniors. It represents a core value system that has made this country great. It embodies the principle that citizens who work hard all their lives, raise their children, pay their bills, and play by the rules will not be thrown out onto the street in their sunset years.

This budget has nothing to do with saving Medicare or with paying off our debt. It has everything to do with tax cuts for the rich, and health care for the seniors is an easy target. When the bells sound for Members to record their votes, I hope my colleagues will put the American people before the special interests. The American people deserve no less.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it pains me to get up here and have to talk about this subject, but it needs to be said.

I served here in the House in 1965 when Mr. DOLE voted against Medicare. I saw him do it, I heard him do it, and it pains me to hear that Speaker GINGRICH now says, yes, we have a plan to get rid of Medicare, but we cannot do it right now because, if we do, the seniors will get mad at us.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the seniors this. This bill contains the Medicare cuts. The bill contains the end of Medicare. Let me tell the seniors where it is in this bill. It is in the fail-safe device that the Republicans put in this Medicare bill. It is tucked in their where we cannot see. We do not know it is going to hit us, but it requires the Secretary of HEW to make the cuts in Medicare, particularly in the fee-for-service part of Medicare, if all of their wonderful, dreamy goals are not met to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, it is all in this bill today, and Members of Congress should realize that when they vote for this today, particularly Republican Members of Congress ought to realize, that when they vote on this today, and listen to me, Mr. SOLOMON, listen to me, listen to me:

When you vote for this today, you're voting to end Medicare. You're voting

to end Medicare. Don't be hoodwinked. It is in your proposal. It is in there in the fail-safe device that will put an end to Medicare, and the Gingrich-Dole plan to end Medicare is in this vote today.

This is a serious, serious matter. This is not just about balancing the budget. This is putting an end, this proposal that DOLE and GINGRICH have cooked up, to get rid of Medicare.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Loveland, CO [Mr. ALLARD], a very distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today, the 104th Congress will make history. We will enact a 7-year program that will balance the Federal budget for the first time in 33 years. For far too long, the Federal Government has lived too well. It has done so at the expense of hard-working Americans.

Deficits became a way of life for the Federal Government in the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's. Unfortunately, they have continued into the 1990's. This plan marks a fundamental departure from the past by finally putting Uncle Sam on a diet.

This new Congress has kept its commitment to our children and grandchildren. We said we would balance the budget, and we will do it.

Last spring, defenders of the status quo defeated a balanced budget constitutional amendment. This was a setback, and many observers felt that Republicans would then simply abandon the hard work of actually balancing the budget. The skeptics were wrong. They misjudged our resolve.

Those of us elected to Congress in recent years have been particularly committed to changing the way the Federal Government does business. For years, as a veterinarian, small business owner, and State legislator, I watched one Congress after another squander our children's economic future. I grew sick of it.

Even when the American people elected Ronald Reagan as President in two successive landslides, the Congress ignored his desire to slow the growth of Federal spending. President Reagan was fond of saying that "we could say they [Congress] spend money like drunken sailors, but that would be unfair to drunken sailors." At least "the sailors are spending their own money."

When I ran for Congress in 1990, I made one principle commitment to the people of Colorado, I would do everything I could to balance the Federal budget. That is why I am so proud to stand here today and cast what will surely be one of the most important votes I will ever cast.

Judging by the rhetoric of those who oppose this plan one might get the impression that it contains devastating cuts. This charge indicates how far removed from reality the defenders of deficits have drifted. This budget does not cut spending at all, it simply slows the rate of increase.

Let me review some very important numbers. Over the last 7 years Federal

spending totaled \$9.5 trillion. Over the 7 years of this balanced budget plan, 1996-2002, the Federal Government will spend a total of over \$12 trillion. Where I come from that is an increase, and it is a very substantial one.

Similarly, for those who seem to think the family and business tax cuts are excessive, I point out that over the last 7 years total Federal tax receipts were just under \$8 trillion, while over the next 7 years Federal tax receipts will total \$11.2 trillion. That also is an increase. In fact, our tax cut reduces projected tax receipts over the next 7 years by only 2 percent. That's right, 2 percent less revenue. And we give the money back to the hard-working families who earned it in the first place.

The modest tax cut makes particular sense in light of President Clinton's revelation that even he believes the 1993 tax hike was excessive.

It is important to keep in mind why we must balance the budget. This endeavor is about much more than numbers. It is about the future standard of living for our children.

Much focus has been placed on the supposed pain of the budget restraint in our plan. This ignores the vast benefits of balancing the budget.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has stated repeatedly that balancing the budget will have a dramatic positive impact on the confidence of American families. He has also made clear his belief that interest rates would drop significantly. This view is confirmed by a recent DRI/McGraw-Hill analysis for the National Association of Realtors. According to their data, the average 30-year mortgage will drop 2.7 percentage points. On a 30-year \$50,000 mortgage at 8¼-percent interest, families would save over \$1,000 a year in interest payments. Now that is a real difference in people's lives.

Similarly, college loans would be much more manageable. A college student who borrows \$11,000 at 8-percent interest will pay more than \$2,000 less in total interest payments if rates drop just 2 percent.

Another example comes with the farm sector. While this budget reduces farm payments by \$13 billion over 7 years, the Agriculture Committee estimates that a 1.5-percent reduction in interest rates will save farmers over \$15 billion in payments on the outstanding farm debt over the next 7 years. And under our Freedom to Farm plan those farmers will have much more freedom to plant the crops they wish. They will also run their farms with fewer Agriculture Department bureaucrats lending a helping hand.

These are just a few examples of how lower interest rates will help families and our economy. Younger generations will benefit from lower rates for decades to come.

But it is not just the young who benefit from this budget, it is also seniors. This is a senior friendly budget. We do not touch Social Security, and we still increase Medicare spending by 6.5 percent a year. In the process we give seniors much greater freedom and control over the expenditure of their health care dollars.

I have been particularly gratified by the large number of letters I have received from seniors who say "just do it!" They realize that some sacrifice will be required of them, but

they want the budget balanced, an they know that we strengthen Social Security and Medicare by getting our fiscal house in order.

Last year, we made a contract with America. This balanced budget represents the very essence of that contract—a Federal Government that will be smaller, less intrusive, and more efficient. We have kept our contract, and in so doing we have done more to restore faith in our form of government than has been done in many years.

□ 1030

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, although I support a balanced budget, this Republican bill is too extreme. It takes our country in the wrong direction.

I want to make it clear to the American people exactly what is wrong with this bill.

The Republican bill cuts student loans and forces students and their parents to bear the burden of paying even more for a college education.

It makes excessive cuts to Medicare by increasing the average senior's out-of-pocket cost by nearly \$400 per year in order to give a tax break for the wealthy.

It makes deep cuts in long term care that will raise the cost for nursing homes and will force seniors out of nursing homes, or bankrupt their families who are trying to care for their parents and grandparents.

It eliminates the guarantee of Medicaid by threatening the health care of over 36 million low-income children, elderly, and disabled Americans—our most vulnerable Americans.

It curbs the quality of nursing homes for elderly Americans by repealing the minimum Federal requirements.

And it cuts the earned income tax credit which provides a modest tax break for the lowest-income families. These EITC cuts are a tax increase on the lowest-income working families in our country.

I am pleased that there will be a strong democratic alternative that has been praised by the Washington Post as a respectable, disciplined alternative that is easily the best horse in the race. It will balance the budget by 2002 without the extreme cuts in Medicare, it gets rid of any tax cut until the budget is balanced, it preserves the tax credit for the working poor, and it does not cut education.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get our House in order, yet it should be done the smart way. The Republican bill only burdens hard-working, middle class Americans for the benefit of the wealthy and it must be defeated.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Republican Contract With America tax act came to the floor a few months ago, I raised the point that that was in violation of the law that was passed at the very beginning of this session, that any

tax increase required a three-fifths vote of this Congress. At the time, the Parliamentarian accepted what was certainly a specious judgment on the part of the Joint Tax Committee, that it did not in fact increase taxes. Subsequently, the Parliamentarian has conceded that it did, and in fact should have been required to have a three-fifths vote of this Congress in order to pass the House.

What has occurred subsequently, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition that much of our tax legislation does in fact violate that law that we chose to apply to ourselves, at least the Republican side of the aisle chose to apply it, but I think the vast majority of us agree, and what is most troubling is that in the biggest bills, for example, in the Medicare bill that we just took up, a \$270 billion bill, the rule waived this three-fifths requirement.

There are some taxpayers who will in fact pay a 50 percent tax increase on the part B Medicare insurance premium. They are not aware of that. Most Members in the Congress are not. Certainly, it is in gross violation of the three-fifths requirement. That is why it was waived.

Again today, this rule waives that three-fifths requirement. I understand the argument that was raised, although I certainly cannot agree with it. Essentially what we are saying is it is inconvenient to apply it. There are several ways in which we violate the law that we earlier enacted. We passed a law that said that we ought to abide by the laws we apply to the private sector. Certainly, we ought to comply with the laws that we pass for ourselves. We ought not waive it when in fact it is inconvenient. That is what we are doing today.

I could cite several instances where there is, in fact, an income tax increase in this bill that in fact does require that there ought to be a three-fifths rule in order to pass it. I grant you, we will lose the vote on this rule, but the American public needs to know that a rule that they thought was going to protect them is being waived as part of this rule.

The biggest one is an income tax increase that will apply to low-income citizens. I have a long list of every one of the leadership of the Republican side of the aisle here saying that this three-fifths vote was going to protect all Americans. It did not say "all Americans of higher income," it did not say "all Americans except those of low-income." It said all Americans, but today low-income Americans will pay much more in taxes that they cannot afford if we were to pass this bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we've heard talk about this budget. But there's one thing that supporters of this budget have never understood.

They've never understood the soul of this Nation.

They've never understood the poetry that is America.

The dignity of a senior who doesn't have to beg to see a doctor.

The grace of a woman with a disability able to live on her own.

The pride of a student who's earned the grades to go to college.

The self-respect of a mother working her way out of poverty.

People who just need a chance. Who just need someone to believe in them.

This budget doesn't reward the best in us. It appeals to the worst in us.

It doesn't reward our best instincts. It tramples our most basic values.

We're told that this is a courageous budget. But there's nothing courageous about cutting Medicare, Medicaid, and student loans just to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

We're told that Medicare is being saved. But Tuesday, the Senate majority leader bragged he was proud of his 1965 vote against Medicare saying "we knew it wouldn't work."

And yesterday Speaker GINGRICH himself told an insurance group, quote, "We don't get rid of (Medicare) in round one because we don't think that that's smart politically but we believe it's going to wither on the vine."

This budget doesn't save Medicare, it destroys it. And now we have it straight from the horse's mouth.

This budget is nothing but the biggest transfer of wealth from seniors and working families to the wealthy in the history of America.

I say to my Republican friends: don't come to this floor today and tell us that this isn't a tax break for the wealthy. Because 106 members of your own conference once signed a letter that said it was a tax break for the wealthy.

And don't tell us that families will pay less under this budget. Because the bipartisan Committee on Taxation says that 7 out of 10 families will pay the same or more.

It wasn't a Democrat who said, and I quote, "this is a tax increase on low income workers and the poor which is unconscionable at this time." That was Jack Kemp—a Republican.

If this isn't a tax increase then why did you have to wave the rule that says all tax increases require a vote of three-fifths of this House?

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. We may not have the votes to beat this rule. We may not have the votes to beat this budget. But we do have the votes to sustain a veto.

I urge my colleagues: Stop this tax increase on families. Stop this destruction of Medicare. Stop this war on our kids. And say no to this shameful budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules and one of the most fiscally conservative Members of this body.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago next month I had the opportunity, having worked hard in his campaign, to vote for the reelection of George Bush. Like most Republicans, I was saddened

that he was not reelected, but it really began a new day for me. I was elected in 1980 and had served for 12 years with Republican Presidents. I was ready to take on this new experience of serving with a Member of the opposing political party down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

A few weeks after the election I wrote an Op-Ed piece in the Los Angeles Times. The L.A. Times has been held up here this morning. In that piece I talked about the fact that if Bill Clinton remained a new kind of Democrat, as he said he was throughout his campaign, I would do everything that I possibly could to support him.

In fact, throughout his campaign, remember, he talked about a balanced budget. That is exactly what we are pursuing with this legislation. He talked about health care reform. We are going at it a slightly different way than he probably had envisaged in his campaign in dealing with Medicare, but he nonetheless did talk about health care reform. He talked about welfare reform, individual initiative, and responsibility. That is exactly what we are working on in this legislation.

He also talked about the need for us to move ahead with reducing the tax burden on middle-income working Americans. We know that 75 percent of the tax reduction in this package goes to people earning less than \$60,000 a year. He also talked about reducing the capital gains tax rate. Why? Because he knew that encouraging savings and investment and productivity would be key to economic growth.

It seems to me that, as we look at these items, along with his desire to reduce the regulatory burden that he outlined in his campaign, we, with this reconciliation package, are in fact helping him keep his campaign promises of 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that while the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and I were yesterday in the Committee on Rules saying "Gosh, if you look at the fact that over the next 7 years we are going to see a 24-percent increase, a 24-percent increase in the level of Federal spending," that gives some of us a little concern. What it does is it shows that we are willing to recognize that there is a Democrat in the White House, there are Democrats in both Houses of Congress, and we are trying to do this in a bipartisan way.

Tragically, rather than recognizing that it is a 24-percent increase, all they do is describe it as draconian cuts. We are working to protect, preserve, and strengthen the Medicare system, contrary to anything that has been said on the other side of the aisle. Actually, this package does just that.

One of the great concerns in my State of California happens to be the issue of illegal immigration. While we are working toward a balanced budget

we are actually increasing three times as much as the President does in his budget to deal with the issue of illegal immigration.

Reimbursement for Medicaid. We also, in this package, are looking at reimbursement to the States for the incarceration of illegals. This rule will deal with that issue, the Bliley amendment.

It seems to me that we have a great responsibility as Members of Congress to try to come together in a bipartisan way. I am very happy to say that our party does have the majority that we need to pass this very important measure, so we can get on that glidepath toward a balanced budget, so we can in fact reduce the tax burden on working Americans, and so we can, as a byproduct of that, decrease interest rates and put into place the kind of government that the American people desperately want.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on this rule, and an "aye" vote for the reconciliation package.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would say first of all to my friend, the gentleman from California, that 22,750 working families in his own district will have their taxes raised by this bill that they are so strongly supporting.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question. If the previous question is defeated we shall offer an amendment which would do two things: Strike the increase on taxes on 8 million American working families that the bill causes by cutting the earned income tax credit; and it would, second, strike the provision in the rule waiving the requirement for a three-fifths vote on any measure carrying a Federal income tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, I include our amendment for the RECORD, and I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

On page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike "modified by the amendments printed in the report" and insert "modified by the amendments printed in section 3 of this resolution and in the report".

On page 4, lines 7 through 9, strike "Clause 5(c) of rule XXI shall not apply to the bill, amendments thereto, or conference reports thereon."

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Strike sections 13701 and 13702 (relating to earned income tax credit) and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just have sat here for an hour in total amazement, because I have heard speaker after speaker after speaker after speaker stand up and say "We

need to spend more money here, we need to spend more money there." Mr. Speaker, we have been spending more money here and more money there for years and years. We have just about ruined this country.

It means so much to young people today to be able to have a job and to be able to take home enough pay to save a little bit of money each week in order to accumulate a downpayment on a home, and then to have enough money in their take home pay to meet a mortgage, and then to have children. That is what I did with my family many years ago. We had five children almost right in a row, and then we had to educate them all and put them in college at one time, but we were able to accumulate a little bit of money in order to buy that home and to educate those children. Today, they cannot do that, because the Government takes so much money out of their pocket. I hear that we are cutting this budget.

When some of our colleagues were going to the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and complaining that we were cutting too much, or they wanted to spend more here, I went to him and said "Mr. Speaker, I don't think we are cutting enough. We are going to spend \$3 trillion more over the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years. That is an increase in spending almost across the board. It is not enough."

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, it is a giant step in the right direction.

We have a \$5 trillion debt today, and that costs the taxpayers \$250 billion in interest just to pay the Netherlands and Great Britain and the foreign countries that hold our debt, \$250 billion that we cannot use to spend on truly needed programs. When President Clinton gave us a budget this year, it called for \$1 additional trillion added to the national debt. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues what that would have done to that interest payment. It would have increased it by another \$100 billion.

God forbid in inflation had set back in like it did in the late 1970's under President Jimmy Carter at 10 and 11 and 12 percent. That interest payment annually would have grown to \$600 billion. Every time you spend more money on interest, you have less money to help the truly needy.

The fiscally responsible thing to do is to support this rule and support this bill. We have to do it for the future of this country, and I urge support for the rule and the bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for a number of reasons.

This rule would send to the floor provisions which increase payroll taxes on Federal employees and increase agency pension costs which have never been reported by any committee. It does so for one simple reason: to finance tax cuts for the wealthy.

You can forget all of our chairman's talk about shoring up the fiscal stability of the Federal retirement system. Both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service have confirmed that the system is sound and that it will always have sufficient assets to cover benefit payments to future and current retirees. There is no retirement crisis. These increases are unnecessary.

With respect to the Department of Commerce, the Republican leadership has chosen to ignore the work of at least five committees that marked-up this legislation. By doing so, the leadership also trashed the rules and procedures which are in place to ensure that this body functions as a democratic institution.

I find it disingenuous that the Republican leadership abolishes the Minority Business Development Agency. They are still funding the Market Promotion Program to promote hamburgers overseas, but they abolish the only agency willing to help minority-owned business get access to markets.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose any effort to include the Debt Collection Improvement Act as part of reconciliation. This is a violation of committee procedure, and a violation of good faith.

Take my word for it: Members on both sides will regret passing this bill that takes money from the checks of poor Social Security recipients, and requires our elderly constituents to use automatic funds transfers at a bank to collect their Social Security.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. This budget includes many provisions that harm hardworking Americans. Several of these provisions do not belong in reconciliation. They deserve a separate vote. The House should have a conversation on these provisions.

An example of these provisions is the earned income tax credit [EITC]. The EITC will be drastically cut. The incentive to get off welfare and to work will be gutted. Jack Kemp testified on October 19 before the Senate Small Business Committee and stated

"I hope you guys do not go too far on removing the EITC because that is a tax increase on low income workers and the poor which is unconscionable at this time."

Another example is the corporate pension reversion provision. I went to the Rules Committee with several of my colleagues and requested that we have a separate debate on this provision. We were denied. Corporations should not be allowed to raid pension funds.

There are many provisions in this budget that are unconscionable. Let's go back to the drawing board and come up with a budget that we can be proud to present to the people we represent.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that the rule that we are about to vote on waives the requirement of a 60-percent majority for a bill carrying an income tax rate increase?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORAN. On April 5, more than 6 months ago, I came to this well and raised a point of order on a provision of the Contract With America Tax Relief Act. It was H.R. 1215 that repealed section 1(h) of the Internal Revenue Code affecting the maximum rate for long-term capital gains.

While the intent of this provision was to lower the capital gains rate, it actually increased the tax rate on the sale of certain small business stocks from 14 percent under current law to 19.8 percent. At that time, the Speaker ruled that this tax increase was not subject to the three-fifth rule.

In a June 12 letter, however, from House Parliamentarian Charles Johnson, it appears that the ruling was made in error, and the original point of order should have been sustained.

Mr. Speaker, am I correct in my summation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Traditionally, the Chair does not rule on hypothetical questions or rule in advance on questions not yet presented. The Chair so responded to a parliamentary inquiry on October 19 during the consideration of a special order waiving the precise rule proposed to be waived by the pending special order. In other words, the Chair will not presume to respond to a question that is not presented as a matter in which the Chair might be required to hear argument and render a decision.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORAN. Is it possible to waive this rule by a simple majority which was advertised by its sponsors as requiring a 60-percent majority for income tax rate increases, or does this rule need a 60-percent majority for its adoption?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Adoption of this rule only requires a majority vote.

Mr. MORAN. Despite the fact that it is waiving a rule that required a 60-percent majority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORAN. Is it true that the bill before us today contains other tax increases that would make this bill subject to a three-fifths vote?

These additional taxes include a 50-percent tax penalty on Medicare-plus medical savings accounts withdrawals for any purpose other than medical care.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order. The gentleman is making a speech.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am explaining the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot rule on a bill that is not yet before the House.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry applies to the rule that is before us and is about to be voted on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled on that.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am itemizing six tax rate increases that should have required a three-fifths vote, and I want to clarify that it would trigger a three-fifths vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would point out that what the gentleman is referring to may be in a bill that is not yet before the body, and the Chair cannot rule on that until it is before the body, and the Chair has already ruled on the matter before us.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, if I may further clarify my intent, this is establishing a precedent.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order. This is not a parliamentary inquiry. Let us get on with it. Come on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The adoption of this rule will waive the rule that the gentleman is currently citing. The gentleman's questions are hypothetical at this point.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that the very real six tax increases that are contained in this bill be put into the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, is the supermajority, the alleged taxpayer protection provision rule that is being suspended here the same rule that was suspended last week in the Medicare debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just cited that it is clause 5(c) of rule XXI that is being waived.

Mr. DOGGETT. So it was waived last week and waived this week.

Mr. Speaker, is this supermajority protection for taxpayers as alleged in permanent suspension, or will it ever be applied?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a correct parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if he understands that I was only attempting to put information into the RECORD.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the previous question has been moved. If the gentleman wants to do it during the debate on the bill, that is one thing, but we have moved the previous question and we want to get on with the business. The gentleman knows that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 738]

YEAS—228

Allard	Ensign	Laughlin
Archer	Everett	Lazio
Armey	Ewing	Leach
Bachus	Fawell	Lewis (CA)
Baker (CA)	Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)
Baker (LA)	Flanagan	Lightfoot
Ballenger	Foley	Linder
Barr	Forbes	Livingston
Barrett (NE)	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bartlett	Fox	Longley
Bass	Franks (CT)	Lucas
Bateman	Franks (NJ)	Manzullo
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	Martini
Bilbray	Frisa	McCollum
Bilirakis	Funderburk	McCreery
Bliley	Gallely	McDade
Blute	Ganske	McHugh
Boehlert	Gekas	McInnis
Boehner	Gilchrest	McKeon
Bonilla	Gillmor	Metcalf
Bono	Gilman	Meyers
Brownback	Goodlatte	Mica
Bryant (TN)	Goodling	Miller (FL)
Bunn	Gordon	Molinari
Bunning	Goss	Moorhead
Burr	Graham	Morella
Burton	Gunderson	Myers
Buyer	Gutknecht	Myrick
Callahan	Hancock	Nethercutt
Calvert	Hansen	Neumann
Camp	Hastert	Ney
Canady	Hastings (WA)	Norwood
Castle	Hayworth	Nussle
Chabot	Hefley	Oxley
Chambliss	Heineman	Packard
Chenoweth	Herger	Parker
Christensen	Hilleary	Paxon
Chrysler	Hobson	Petri
Clinger	Hoekstra	Pombo
Coble	Hoke	Porter
Coburn	Horn	Portman
Collins (GA)	Hostettler	Pryce
Combest	Houghton	Quillen
Cooley	Hunter	Quinn
Cox	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Crapo	Hyde	Ramstad
Creameans	Inglis	Regula
Cubin	Istook	Riggs
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Davis	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Deal	Jones	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Roth
Dickey	Kim	Roukema
Doolittle	King	Royce
Dornan	Kingston	Salmon
Dreier	Klug	Sanford
Duncan	Knollenberg	Saxton
Dunn	Kolbe	Scarborough
Ehlers	LaHood	Schaefer
Ehrlich	Largent	Schiff
Emerson	Latham	Seastrand
English	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adams
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
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)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson

Crane
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Greenwood
McIntosh

NOT VOTING—13

Mfume
Miller (CA)
Sisisky
Talent
Towns

□ 1112

Mr. BARCIA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DELAY, HEINEMAN, and GORDON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stockman
Stump
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker

NAYS—191

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 739]

AYES—235

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Molinari
Archer	Frisa	Montgomery
Armey	Funderburk	Moorhead
Bachus	Gallely	Morella
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Myers
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Myrick
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Barr	Gillmor	Neumann
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Ney
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Norwood
Barton	Goodling	Nussle
Bass	Goss	Oxley
Bateman	Graham	Packard
Bereuter	Gunderson	Packer
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Paxon
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bliley	Hancock	Pombo
Blute	Hansen	Porter
Boehlert	Hastert	Portman
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pryce
Bonilla	Hayes	Quillen
Bono	Hayworth	Quinn
Brownback	Hefley	Radanovich
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Ramstad
Bunn	Herger	Regula
Bunning	Hilleary	Riggs
Burr	Hobson	Roberts
Burton	Hoekstra	Rogers
Buyer	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Calvert	Roth
Camp	Houghton	Roukema
Canady	Hunter	Royce
Castle	Hutchinson	Salmon
Chabot	Hyde	Sanford
Chambliss	Inglis	Saxton
Chenoweth	Istook	Scarborough
Christensen	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Chrysler	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Clinger	Jones	Seastrand
Coble	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Kelly	Shadegg
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shaw
Combest	King	Shays
Cooley	Kingston	Shuster
Cox	Klug	Skeen
Crapo	Knollenberg	Skelton
Creameans	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cubin	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Cubin	Smith (TX)
Davis	Cunningham	Smith (WA)
Deal	Davis	Solomon
DeLay	Deal	Souder
Diaz-Balart	DeLay	Spence
Dickey	Diaz-Balart	Stearns
Doolittle	Dickey	Stockman
Dornan	Doolittle	Stump
Dreier	Dornan	Tanner
Duncan	Dreier	Tate
Dunn	Duncan	Tauzin
Ehlers	Dunn	Taylor (MS)
Ehrlich	Ehlers	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	Ehrlich	Thomas
English	Emerson	Thornberry
Ensign	English	Tiahrt
Everett	Ensign	Torkildsen
Ewing	Everett	Upton
Fawell	Ewing	Vucanovich
Fields (TX)	Fawell	Waldholtz
Foley	Fields (TX)	Walker
Forbes	Foley	Walsh
Fowler	Forbes	Wamp
Fox	Fowler	Watts (OK)
Franks (CT)	Fox	Weldon (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Franks (CT)	Weller
	Franks (NJ)	White

Whitfield	Young (AK)	Zimmer
Wicker	Young (FL)	
Wolf	Zeliff	

NOES—185

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gephardt	Obey
Andrews	Geren	Olver
Baesler	Gibbons	Ortiz
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Orton
Barcia	Gordon	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Green	Pallone
Becerra	Gutierrez	Pastor
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Berman	Harman	Pelosi
Bevill	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Bishop	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Hilliard	Pickett
Borski	Hinchee	Pomeroy
Boucher	Holden	Poshard
Brewster	Hoyer	Rahall
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Reed
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Richardson
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Chapman	Johnston	Rose
Clay	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kaptur	Rush
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Coleman	Kennelly	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Kleczka	Schumer
Conyers	Klink	Scott
Costello	LaFalce	Serrano
Coyne	Lantos	Skaggs
Cramer	Levin	Slaughter
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
de la Garza	Lincoln	Stark
DeFazio	Lipinski	Stenholm
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stokes
Dellums	Lowey	Studds
Deutsch	Luther	Stupak
Dicks	Maloney	Tejeda
Dingell	Manton	Thompson
Dixon	Markey	Thornton
Doggett	Martinez	Thurman
Dooley	Mascara	Torres
Doyle	Matsui	Torricelli
Durbin	McCarthy	Trafficant
Edwards	McDermott	Velazquez
Engel	McHale	Vento
Eshoo	McKinney	Visclosky
Evans	McNulty	Ward
Farr	Meehan	Waters
Fattah	Meek	Watt (NC)
Fazio	Menendez	Waxman
Filner	Minge	Williams
Flake	Mink	Wilson
Flanagan	Moakley	Wise
Foglietta	Mollohan	Woolsey
Ford	Moran	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wynn
Frost	Nadler	Yates
Furse	Neal	

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (FL)	Mfume	Towns
Crane	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Sisisky	Volkmer
Greenwood	Talent	Weldon (PA)

□ 1121

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

LIST OF TAX INCREASES WHICH SHOULD REQUIRE A THREE-FIFTHS VOTE FOR PASSAGE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a list of the six tax increases that require a waiver of the three-fifths vote into the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The list referred to is as follows:

These are a total of six tax increases in this bill. These increases are in direct violation of a law enacted on the first day of this session, which should require a three-fifths vote for passage. These tax increases are the following:

First, a 50 percent tax penalty on Medicare Plus Medical Savings Accounts for any purpose other than medical care;

Second, the Medicare Part B income contingent premium;

Third, repeal of the 5-year income averaging rule on lump sum pension distributions;

Fourth, increase in the phase-out rate for the Earned Income Tax Credit;

Fifth, the new rates applied to expatriates; and

Sixth, the new tax imposed on gambling income of Indian tribes.

Mr. Speaker, would any or all of these tax increases trigger the celebrated rule requiring a three-fifths vote majority for approval? Since your answer is yes, but for the waiver of the rule by the Republican leadership, it is important to note Mr. Speaker, when the history of this Congress is written, the main theme will be about the majority's unrelenting attack on the poor and defenseless in our society, but a chapter, however, should be reserved for its hypocrisy which is clearly evident today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, travel delays last Tuesday, October 24, prevented me from casting my vote on H.R. 1595, the bill to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem.

I would have voted "yes" on the bill had I been present for the vote.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST REFORM

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 245, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for raising the Social Security earnings limit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman the designee of the majority leader?

Mr. HASTERT. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from

Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], who I presume is the designee of the minority leader, will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution, which Senator DOLE and Senator MCCAIN will be introducing in the other body, is very straightforward. Because of the unique rules of the other body, it is not possible for us to lift the Social Security earnings limit in the reconciliation bill before this House today.

But an overwhelming majority of this House and of the other body favor such a move. In fact, the President of the United States, in his 1992 campaign platform "Putting People First" also expressed his commitment to lifting the Social Security earnings limit.

We all agree that it is simply wrong to penalize low and middle income seniors who must work, with a tax rate equal to that of millionaires. These seniors are some of our most productive and responsible workers. They are working to provide for themselves. They do not want to be a burden to their families or the taxpayers of this Nation. We should be rewarding such behavior, not penalizing it.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution is intended to do two things. First, it restates the commitment of this House to lift the Social Security earnings limit this year. We have already passed a measure in this House to lift the earnings limit on Social Security and we expect our colleagues in the other body to take it up shortly.

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I support increasing the Social Security earnings test. I believe that we should be encouraging work for all Americans, especially those who have a lifetime of experience. The current annual Social Security earnings limit of \$11,000 penalizes too many who want to work after 65.

I know that many workings seniors will be disappointed today that the increase in the Social Security earnings test passed earlier this year by the House is going to be dropped by the reconciliation bill. Instead, we are voting today on a resolution which merely states that Congress intends to address this issue and I thank the gentleman for this resolution, but when we do raise the earnings test, let us make sure we do so without adversely impacting the Social Security trust funds.

We do not want to reduce the solvency of the funds that guarantee every retiree a return on the money they paid into the system. Let us again find a responsible, sensible way to increase the earnings test, so that all