

I do not oppose this resolution on its merits. Peace, with congressional approval, is good. Military deployment, with congressional approval, is good. I oppose the resolution because of the process in which it is being considered. No hearings, no committee consideration, no adequate debate, or discussion.

Let us allow the negotiators to negotiate. If and when they are able to come to an agreement for peace in Bosnia, then let the Congress judge the merits of that settlement.

And in the meantime, let us process important business like this in a proper legislative fashion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 247.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 247.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-297) on the resolution (H. Res. 248) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House rule XX, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KASICH moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2491), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, with a Senate amendment

thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 1 hour on his motion.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have the right to yield blocks of time for purposes of debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

□ 1800

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if am I correct that will be five Republican and three Democratic conferees for all titles of the bill under current plans?

Mr. KASICH. The answer is yes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, in the case of other committees, in most cases, except for those issues relating to tax, trade, and Medicare and Medicaid, there will only be two majority and one minority conferee?

Mr. KASICH. In most cases that would be correct.

Mr. SABO. So, the agreement in those conferences would really be governed by the general conferees, the five Republicans and three Democrats, and then the two from that particular committee of the majority and one for the minority?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. So that in an area like agriculture, where we are doing a major rewrite of agriculture policy, there would be 11 conferees; and 3 of them, 2 majority and 1 minority, from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, in the case of agriculture, the Republicans would have three, the Democratic Party would have two.

Mr. SABO. Then that's changed recently?

Mr. KASICH. Correct.

Mr. SABO. But, Mr. Speaker, I would still be eight general conferees and only five from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. So, the general conferees, if they agreed, would outvote the Committee on Agriculture members 8 to 5?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would not anticipate that happening, but theoretically that would be possible.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, as I think everyone agrees, this is a major rewrite of agriculture policy in this country then being done by five members from that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I come to protest the composition of the conference and to object to going to conference.

Mr. Speaker, the word I had, up until the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] mentioned, was that we would have one conferee from the minority from the Committee on Agriculture. I am now informed that it would be two. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, there was a book written once by a great American called "The Arrogance of Power." We are experiencing that at this precise moment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture debated and voted three times. None of the measures prevailed, therefore, the Committee on Agriculture did not submit a measure by a majority vote to the conference committee. But there is something called the Freedom to Farm Act that was then placed by either the Committee on the Budget or the Committee on Rules in the legislation without any contribution, debate, or participation of the Committee on Agriculture. It was done by the leadership; by the leadership of the Committee on the Budget and by the leadership of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I protest that move vehemently. I think it is an insult to American agriculture. I think it is an insult to the American consumers who are the ultimate recipients of the legislation enacted heretofore by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that this is not only demeaning but insulting, that a revamping of the farm legislation is being done with only two members of the minority in the Committee on Agriculture and that they would be outvoted, nonetheless, by non-Committee on Agriculture general members of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Department of Agriculture established by President Lincoln, this has not happened. In our bipartisan handling of legislation, my experience here has always been that we come up with a bipartisan approach, consensus approach to the legislation by which agriculture, to some extent rural America, and the consumers would be serving under or receive the benefit thereof.

Mr. speaker, I protest. I know that I have heard it for so many years from our colleagues on the other side that we do not have the votes, so all we can do is expose, Mr. Speaker, the damage that has been done that can be done, that damage that it will do to the legislative system. I think that it basically begins the erosion of this great institution called the House of Representatives, which we once called, and still call, the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, no longer will it be the people's House, but rather it will be by ad hoc committees at the whim of whoever is in the leadership. And if this is the way that we will act heretofore,

then the people have lost. The people have lost their ability to participate. The people have lost their ability to provide counsel to the members of the different committees. It is the people's loss, it will be if we go to conference with these numbers and this distribution. It will be the people's loss and the people are the ones that hopefully will rebel at the appropriate time.

But as of now, the dismantling of the people's House, this great institution called the House of Representatives, that is being nullified by what we do this evening. And I feel sad, really, and aggrieved that this would happen with such little ability to protest, to challenge, and the disruption that will happen in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have the ability only to address this House for 5 minutes. This is not right. This is not fair. This is an arrogant abuse of power, and this is an insult to the history of this House and to the American people.

I have had my say, Mr. Speaker, but I hope that the people out there realize, all of those involved in agriculture, all of those involved in rural America, all of those that are looking forward to bettering their lives, to bettering the environment, to bringing water into the countryside, to continue bringing electricity, to continue bringing telephone, to continue providing these things that enhance the quality of life.

The American people are the best-fed people in the world for the least amount of disposable income of any major industrialized nation in the world. That has been done because of the system of this House, the system of the committee, and we have done and followed through with precedent that has been laid heretofore.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness in my heart that I make this statement that the people of the United States of America lose tonight. Especially those in agriculture and rural America lose tonight, because they will not have an opportunity to address the issues fairly, equitably.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the numbers, but the numbers are not what we are challenging per se; that there is a majority and that there is a minority. But the ability to represent the people has been denied, has been denied, and the people lose. The people will be the losers tonight. It is so said—the arrogance of power prevails and the people lose.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] want to yield to anyone?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], that we are kind of reserving our time. Unless we hear something that we think we need to really make a point on, we are going to reserve our time and hold our fire until the motion to instruct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he is planning on a 30-minute speech.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, right now we are not, but as the gentleman

knows, these things are always subject to dramatic change. But at this point we are going to reserve our time.

Mr. SABO. Unless the gentleman gets motivated?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, we are very motivated; we are waiting for some good points to be made by the other side. No, I am just kidding.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, now I am personally aggrieved that I would not even move the gentleman's inner feelings of his heart when he is preparing, here at Halloween, to dismantle American agriculture, to cut its throat, to bleed it to the last drop of blood, and it had no impact.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I call the arrogance of power. The gentleman has just demonstrated that very well.

Mr. Speaker, very respectfully and kindly and with the admiration and respect that I have for the gentleman, I am personally aggrieved that I would not move the gentleman at this point.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman we are confident at the end of the day we are going to, of course, have a plan that will emerge from the conference committee that will be a plan that people across the country will continue to support, and we feel we are on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, I know, feels strongly about this area. He has been chairman of the committee that has been under the control of the Democratic Party for 40 straight years. I appreciate the points that the gentleman has made, but we really believe at the end of the day the farmers of this country will be happy with what we have.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the agriculture component of the conference committee as well, and I suggest straight out that a conference committee of five is an insult to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, the component of the Budget Reconciliation Act relating to agriculture has been handled in a way unlike any other for development of a farm bill in the history of farm bills in this country.

I represent more production agriculture than any other Member of this House. I also come to this issue as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the Committee on the Budget. Mr. Speaker, let me briefly recap the very curious turn of events that has followed the development of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in August, not until August but in early August the chairman dropped a bill called the Freedom to Farm Act. We were told that was going

to be the Budget component of the 1995 farm bill. The bill did not receive a single hearing in the Committee on Agriculture or the subcommittee. No hearings.

On the day of the markup, after a long day, protracted debate, the bill was defeated with Republicans and Democrats voting against the Freedom to Farm Act. The committee was reconvened the next morning and informed that there would be no more committee meetings on the agriculture component of the budget. In other words, the House Committee on Agriculture was to have nothing to say about the critical part of the budget relating to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it has never been like that. It is the House Committee on Agriculture that knows something about agriculture. That is why it ought to come through the House Committee on Agriculture, not go around it.

When the Committee on the Budget marked up the reconciliation act, there was something, by my eyes very important, missing and that was the agriculture part of the budget. It was nowhere to be seen. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget told us that he would get it added when he went to the Committee on Rules. Again no involvement of the Committee on the Budget at that stage.

We have the Committee on Agriculture excluded and the Committee on the Budget excluded. The gentleman went to the Committee on Rules and got Freedom to Farm included in the bill that was voted on last week as part of the Budget Reconciliation Act, but the morning papers the day of the budget vote said that a deal had been cut, and Speaker GINGRICH announced that this would be rewritten in conference committee.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what was voted on by the House last week did not mean anything. Now we have excluded the House Committee on Agriculture, the House Committee on the Budget and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we learned this afternoon that it will be decided by a committee of five representing the House; three Republicans, two Democrats. No hearings. No language. No legislative proposal.

Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about here? Agriculture in this country represents one out of six jobs involved in the production of food and fiber for all Americans. It is the single greatest component where we export more than we import. It is truly of vital interest to this country and the legislative process has at every stage of the game flowed solely from the Speaker's office and shut off all meaningful input from those of us representing rural America.

□ 1815

This is no way for the legislative process to unfold. It is no way to leave rural America tonight, wondering what in the world is going to come out of the

conference committee, where the House position is at.

This thing reminds me of a fish. You put a fish in the sun. It starts to stink. You put some sunlight on the process that has involved the formation of agriculture policy in this budget, and it stinks to high heaven. Let me tell my colleagues, rural America deserves a whole lot better than this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] reserves the balance of his time as the floor manager's designee.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed the radical Gingrich plan that will devastate essential services to millions of middle class Americans—all in the name of giving a massive tax break to the wealthiest few.

The Gingrich plan to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare to hand out \$245 billion to corporations and wealthy individuals is an outrage. The American people will not stand for this Gingrich plan.

But now the Republicans say they can't afford to pay the political price to kill Medicare outright. So the Gingrich plan will gut Medicare but will do it covertly so that it will as he says, "wither on the vine."

For millions of Americans, Medicare has stood the test of time as a sacred compact between our Government and our seniors. Medicare 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 into the streets in their sunset years.

We must not allow the Gingrich Republicans to balance the budget on the backs of America's seniors. We must not allow Medicare to become the political football it is in the Gingrich plan. I call on this House to support the motion to instruct the conferees and reject the Gingrich plan.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Democratic chair of the Committee on the Budget for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just noticed in an article in "Roll Call" magazine, it was just published today, the title of it is "SOLOMON Wants Rewright of Three-Fifths Tax Hike Rule, After the GOP Has Waived It Twice." I want to put into the RECORD a statement by my good friend and the respected chairman of the Committee on Rules, when this rule was passed.

He said,

Mr. Speaker, the tax and spend Democrats are at it again. Do you believe it? The Democrats are suing the Republicans to overturn our rules change that requires a three-fifths majority to raise taxes.

Now, this is the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] speaking: "The three-fifths majority vote to raise taxes will stand as a hindrance to any Democrat's attempt to foist more taxes on the American people. There aren't going to be any more." He actually said "There ain't going to be any more," but I wanted to correct his language.

Mr. Speaker, that is the same chairman of the Committee on Rules that now wants to rewrite the rule that we passed on the first day of this session. I have 20 quotes from 20 different Members of the Republican leadership, such as "We required a three-fifths vote to pass any kind of tax increase." I've got the Speaker's quote on it. I will not bore you with all the quotes because they all pretty much say the same thing, that any time there is any kind of tax increase, there will be a requirement that there be a three-fifths vote to pass that.

There are actually five tax increases in this budget reconciliation bill that we will be taking to conference. The reason why we were able to take it to conference is that the chairman of the Committee on Rules decided to waive that rule that applied to the House as of the first day of the session. He waived that particular three-fifths rule as it applies to this reconciliation bill. That was the same technique that was applied to the \$270 billion Medicare bill when it came before us a few days earlier.

Now, there was not a waiver when the original Tax Act came before us, the Contract With America Tax Act. I raised it at that time that it really should have required a three-fifths vote because of the tax increases in it. We got a ruling that subsequently has been reconsidered, and the Parliamentarian agrees that in fact the three-fifths requirement should have applied.

It should have applied here, too, because, when we pass rules for ourselves, we ought to abide by them. I do not think we ought to have the discretion to simply waive them when they are inconvenient. We passed a rule on the same day that says, when we write rules for the private sector, they ought to apply to us as well.

Well, it seems to me, when we pass any kind of Federal rule, we do not waive it for the private sector. We should not waive it for ourselves. There are actually five tax increases in this bill. One would increase for some people by 50 percent the tax on Medicare part B premiums. There is an increase for some on capital gains. There is a repeal of the 5-year income averaging for others. There is an increase in taxes on income that Indian tribes receive. There is increased taxes on expatriates, which I happen to agree with.

But the biggest tax increase is on the people who can least afford it. There is a tax increase on those who qualify for the earned income tax credit. That is

the most shameful. I wish that this House one day would apply the rules that it makes for itself consistently, and not hypocritically.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding time to me. I hope everybody votes for his motion to instruct the conferees.

What is this all about? Well, we have got the House with one position and the other body with the other body's position. What we are saying is at least on their side they showed that they have a little bit bigger heart than the Members on our side. We would like our conferees to go along with those provisions.

What are they saying? Well, in the other body, thank goodness, they stood up and insisted that Medicaid coverage be there for pregnant women and children. I believe that. I certainly hope this body does not turn its back on low-income pregnant women and their children. It also says Medicaid coverage should go to those who are disabled and low income. I believe that, and I think it would be terrible if we went along with this House's position.

They also in the other body came forward and said they insisted that they continue to apply Federal standards to nursing homes. Well, I hope we do not roll back to where we used to be; but, if we stay with our position, that is where we will be going. They can do anything they want to, to people in nursing homes, and there will not be a thing we can say about it.

Listen, there was a reason those regulations went in, and that was because we needed them. There was scandal after scandal. I think, if Federal money goes there, we ought to make sure that there are standards there.

The other issue that the other body did much better on was pensions. Do you realize that this body is going to allow folks to go play with your pension money? Now, let me tell you, if that does not get your attention, you deserve to lose your pension. It is just about that clear.

So let us get your attention. This is about your pension. People who vote no on this are saying they want to stay with our position and trust those moguls. They will do whatever they want with your pension. Wait until you try and go get it.

So vote yes, this is very critical.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, indeed, perhaps since the inevitable was that this was going to pass last week, pass both Houses, and in some ways I welcome that, because it makes it real. There is

something about the Halloween season where we do not really worry about these ghouls and goblins and whatnot because it does not really seem real. This is real. Now that it has passed, the American people have a chance to see firsthand what is in these packages and what can really be happening.

It was interesting, I remember this debate taking place 2 years ago on the President's budget deficit reduction plan and the other side making a lot of statements from some fly-by-night organization about the job loss that would result. They were dead wrong and, in fact, the economy did not get worse as a result of that package, it got better.

These are the same Members that are not bringing this plan, a plan with a \$245 billion tax cut, over 51 percent of the benefits in the House plan going to people making over \$100,000 a year. This is the same group that has now brought us a pension grab plan so that corporations can go and take assets from a pension plan while the stock market is high, but if that stock market fails or falls, then you are going to see a reduction in the value of that pension and it may be then undervalued. This is the same group that brought us relaxation, not relaxation, obliteration of Federal nursing home regulations.

In West Virginia, we did an analysis with the West Virginia State tax department to conclude that 85 percent of all West Virginians will pay more out of pocket with this plan. We like sacrifice. We appreciate sacrifice, but it needs to be evenhanded.

I guess what concerns me finally, Mr. Speaker, is this is not a plan that will balance the Federal budget. I do not think it will do that. Actually, I think it is going to worsen the economy, not make it better. But it is a plan that will definitely unbalance a lot of family budgets. Unbalance family budgets that depend upon student loans. Unbalance family budgets that are looking toward retirement and having that pension there. Unbalance family budgets that need assistance keeping a loved one in a nursing home or long-term care. Unbalance family budgets that are wondering how their loved one, senior citizen, is going to get medical care.

Bad budget, Mr. Speaker. I urge its rejection.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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 thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding time to me.

I hope that we can be constructive this evening for we have failed to address the crisis that has been represented in the national discussion on this issue.

First of all, we have misrepresented to the American people that this budg-

et deficit will be helped by \$270 billion in tax cuts. In doing those tax cuts, we will find that those making over \$100,000, \$200,000, or \$350,000 will be getting a tax cut which they have not requested. But those who are making under \$50,000 and particularly low- and middle-income families will experience a tax increase.

We will lose the earned income tax credit and, in particular, some 60,000 families in the city of Houston will lose the benefit of receiving an earned income tax credit because of this budget reconciliation proposal out of the House of Representatives, those very working people who are working with children, one or more children in the family, who are trying to make ends meet with rent or mortgage payments, trying to cover their health insurance, and yet this Congress has now burdened them with a tax increase.

At the same time we have \$270 billion taken out of our Medicare program in particular, denying many of our senior citizens choice, denying them the opportunity for good health care and subjecting them to long hours and long appointments and lack of care.

I would ask that we listen to the debate on this motion to instruct conferees that would ensure that we minimize the tax increases on those who are low and middle income and particularly cut the tax cuts for the wealthy, because as Members recall, in 1981, when under the Reagan administration those cuts came into play, we went into the worst recession that we could have ever imagined. That does not help budget deficits, when we can document from 1992 to 1995 that the deficit has been coming down.

Vote for this motion to instruct and support children, the disabled, and those senior citizens who need good health care.

□ 1830

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, for those who will not be able to stay tuned and follow this House debate, let me tell them how it is going to end.

My colleagues are going to hear a lot of comments and speeches from this side of the aisle pleading with the Republicans to show some moderation when it comes to the Gingrich budget bill which we passed last week. We will be urging the Republicans in all of our speeches to try to be sensitive to the needs of working families to try to make sure that any tax cuts go directly to real middle-class families and not to the wealthiest people in America. My colleagues will hear our speeches as we urge them to maintain standards for nursing homes so across America each of us with a parent or grandparent who may end up there one day has the peace of mind to know that they are at least going to be in an institution holding to some Federal standards. My colleagues will hear us

plead with the Republicans, "Please protect the pension plans of working Americans. Don't go through with the Gingrich proposal to take away the protection of pensions." Once a person is retired, they are at the mercy of the people who manage the pension plans. Our Federal laws protect those people, and we will then be urging during the course of this debate that the people on the Republican side of the aisle come around and help these folks as well as the poorest among us, the children who depend on Medicaid for basic hospital care who will be disadvantaged by the Gingrich budget of last week.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will hear all these speeches, and let me tell my colleagues how it will end if they cannot stay tuned. We are going to lose. The Democrats are going to lose. The motion to instruct will do down. The Republicans who marched off the cliff with Speaker GINGRICH last week in the Gingrich Republican bill are going to stick with their Speaker even though they know what we are suggesting is reasonable to most Americans, it sounds like common sense. They are going to stick to their program.

Let me tell my colleagues this. Ultimately President Clinton will veto this terrible bill and we will finally get down to the business on a bipartisan basis of coming up with a common-sense solution to reducing this Nation's budget deficit.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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, what should be the goal of this conference? It should be to minimize both tax giveaways for the wealthy and tax increases on low- and middle-income working families. We should try to do something to preserve and protect the health and income security of senior citizens, and we should also avoid increasing the number of Americans lacking access to health care.

So what do we need to do in this conference committee? I think as a priority, accede to the Senate-passed provisions requiring continued Medicaid coverage for low-income pregnant women and children and for the disabled. At the very least what the gentleman from, senior Senator from, Rhode Island has proposed, a member of the majority party. We should agree to the Senate-passed provisions applying to Federal nursing home standards, and we should recede to the Senate position on pension reversions, continuing current-law protections for worker pensions.

What we have is a reconciliation bill that makes deep cuts in long-term care that is going to raise the costs of nursing homes and force seniors out of nursing homes or bankrupt their families who are trying to care for their parents and grandparents. It is also going to eliminate the guarantee of

Medicaid by threatening the health care of over 36 million low-income children. Elderly and disabled Americans are most vulnerable Americans. It is going to curb the quality of nursing homes for elderly Americans by repealing the minimum, and I say the minimum, Federal requirements. But worst, it is going to cut the earned income tax credit a tax increase for working families, the working poor who had a modest tax break, and all of a sudden this is going to be severely dissipated.

Mr. Speaker, there is a good motion to instruct conferees. We should try to send a strong signal. The President should veto this bill, and then serious negotiations should start. Let us get rid of this bizarre atmosphere, bizarre and bazaar atmosphere, that is pervading this legislation.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a question on process and procedure?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to ask for a recorded vote on this, and I am curious. Is the intent to move to the vote on Bosnia before we go to the motion to instruct?

Mr. KASICH. No, I think we are going to move right into the motion to instruct.

Mr. SABO. So, for anyone who is interested, that vote then would probably come after the vote on the motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. That is correct.

Mr. SABO. We have 1 minute remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). Yes, the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is again the final minute of our consideration of the "wreckconciliation," that is spelled "wreck" as in car wreck or disaster for the families that are most directly affected by this bill, those who will be impacted by the new sick tax; that is, Medicare recipients who will suffer under that aspect of the bill and those who will be affected adversely by the new work tax; that is, working families struggling, dependent on one of the tax provisions they have now that will see their taxes go up if they are a family earning \$30,000 or less. Under either the House or the Senate bill they will be wrecked by the reconciliation bill, but, as we consider what will happen in conference, it is important to know that at least on the Senate side some of the more extremist provisions of this Gingrich House were rejected soundly in the Senate, and one would hope the same thing would be done by the conference committee.

For example, the proposal that while we are increasing a tax on work, we would eliminate entirely the alternative minimum tax for some of the richest corporations in this country; that has been removed by the Senate, and I would hope it would be removed by the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. KASICH. The only thing, Mr. Speaker, is I do not know what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] would say if I yielded myself 29 minutes to counter all that.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. I listened to the gentleman from Ohio tell us that, after he had been in front of the Committee on Rules for 2½ hours, he was tired of hearing himself, so I assume he would not yield himself 29 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. All I want to know is, is the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] going to kindly sit here and listen to a 29-minute harangue?

Mr. SABO. I notice the gentleman from Ohio did not listen through all the 30 minutes of speeches on our side.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on that lack of bipartisanship, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2491, be instructed to do everything possible, within the scope of the conference, to minimize both tax cuts for the wealthy and tax increases on low- and middle-income working families, to preserve and protect the health and income security of senior citizens, and to avoid increasing the number of Americans lacking access to health care; and that the House conferees be further instructed to—

(1) agree to the Senate-passed provisions requiring continued Medicaid coverage for low-income pregnant women and children and for disabled persons,

(2) agree to the Senate-passed provisions continuing to apply federal nursing home standards, and

(3) recede to the Senate position on pension reversions, thereby continuing current law protections for workers' pensions.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is not an easy bill to devise a motion to instruct on because the reality is we have a bad House bill and we have a bad Senate bill. So most of the options are pretty bad. So our motion in some cases says, "If you've got a bad provision and there is a worse provision,

please stick with the bad provision." It does not get us anyplace, but, as my colleagues know, what the House did with the earned income tax credit is incredibly bad. What the Senate did is much worse. So stick with the House provision.

There are some parts of the bill, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to offer a motion to instruct on. Both the House and the Senate deal very poorly with low-income seniors who today qualify for having their premiums paid and their deductibles paid by Medicaid. Neither of them are adequate; they are the same. It is impossible within the scope of conference to say to improve it because they are the same.

But there are a few things, a few items, we might suggest to our House conferees: Do the Senate provision; they are not quite as bad. They slightly improve a bad bill. Do not do this dumb pension reversion that raises \$9 billion temporarily, but takes \$40 billion out of trust funds for pensions for American workers. The reality is, even to balance the budget, it does not do us much good because in the year 2002 it is scored as an asterisk that actually loses a little bit of money, so it gives us some temporary receipts, creates a raid on pension funds.

Just simply do not do it. Follow the Senate's lead, overwhelming vote on the Senate floor.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, Federal nursing home regulations did not happen just because somebody wanted to pass some Federal laws. They emerged because over the years there was very serious, fundamental problems in nursing homes as they dealt with the disabled and the elderly population of this country. They emerged because there was a clear need. If they need reform, reform it, but do not throw them out. My colleagues, stick with what the Senate said. Let us keep those Federal standards.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we are going to have a new Medicaid or medigrant program on which we are going to spend over a hundred billion dollars a year. Most certainly the Federal Government can say there are a few things we should do. Stick with the Federal regulations of nursing homes unless there are more comprehensive ones at the State level, but let us make sure that in structuring this program the States at a minimum keep coverage for low-income pregnant women, and children and disabled people.

□ 1845

That is not asking too much. Over \$100 billion of Federal funds, and the suggestion is that we should sort of sit back and be oblivious of what any requirement of those funds are.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent many years in my life dealing with the question of Federalism. This kind of Federalism of this much Federal money, and no expectation that these basic requirements should be part of it, is just

nuts. So our motion to instruct is very basic. Do not do that dump pension deal. Keep the Federal nursing home standards so our disabled and elderly can be in safe surroundings when they have to go to a nursing home.

As we provide over \$100 billion a year to the States, let us simply say that low-income pregnant women and children and disabled people should be able to get health coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote for the motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct conferees has good things, some not so good things, some inaccurate statements. I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that rather than picking and choosing, but beyond that, tying the hands of the conferees of the House as they move into negotiations with the Senate, that we provide, obviously, as much flexibility as we possibly can to our conferees, but we should keep in mind some of the issues that have been argued in this motion to instruct.

I think the gentleman makes a legitimate point. We will, in fact, spend time taking a look at a number of the provisions that have, up until now, been dictated by the Federal Government and we intend to turn over to the States. In the course of trying to decide how much of this we turn over to the States and how much of it we preserve, that is clearly going to be a subject of this conference committee. Nothing is ever done 100 percent.

For example, in our Medigrant program, I believe it is up to 85 percent of all the mandatory spending must continue to be spent on women, children, and disabled persons. That is one of the requirements that we have on the House side as it relates to the Medigrant program. I feel strongly that that be maintained.

As to whether that needs to be maintained, and at the same time call that an entitlement and have the folks here dictate even further to my Governor, the Governor of Ohio, that is a matter for debate and discussion within the conference committee.

Pension provisions, of course, get a little bit more complicated, because the pension provisions require that these funds that are in excess of between 125 and the maximum allowed at 150 percent, that the companies would be permitted to draw down those funds.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would argue that, in fact, giving companies flexibility between 125 percent and 150 percent would bring about additional defined pension plans, which we do not see much of now. Companies are worried they are going to lock their money in the box between 125 and 150 percent.

What is interesting is if you are at 124 percent of liability, you are not affected; only if you are between 125 and 150. However, we have concern on this

side, and we want to talk about this as we get into the conference.

What I would ask the Members to do is to not accept the motion to instruct, because if we do, that is it. That is the end of the day. We would take the motion seriously. Frankly, as we move into discussions between the House and Senate, the House has some concerns about Senate provisions and vice versa. We need to work them out as part of a package, to be mandated in two or three specific areas. To lose the ability of the House of Representatives to drive the best program, to drive the best agreement, I personally believe would be a mistake.

I would ask the Members of the House to reject this motion to instruct, preserve flexibility on the part of the conferees here in the House. We will in fact pay attention to some of the suggestions in this motion, some positive suggestions in this motion, but I would ask that we defeat the motion to instruct. Let us have the flexibility to work out the best program we possibly can.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, if I did not convince the gentleman from Ohio, the next person will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support and ask the House with their strong sense of compassion and realism to vote yes on the motion to instruct. I think that the conferees need to broaden their knowledge of what is going on in this country with the poor and with the near-poor. I think the conferees need some up-to-date information and sensitivity as to what happens in many of the homes in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very, very embarrassed that the Senate has been, certainly, more sensitive to the needs of the poor than has my dearly beloved House. What they have done, as my ranking Member said, they have not done the best, but they have done much better than we have in the House. They have required Medicaid coverage for nursing homes. That was not done just in a vacuum. There is a history behind that, the many horror stories throughout history of what has happened in the nursing homes in this country. We need Federal regulation, and we need Federal oversight of nursing homes.

The Senate went on further to take care of pregnant women and children. I do not think there is any Member of this House who would want to go back to their home State and say to their home constituents that we would leave it up to someone else to take care of poor children, nursing mothers, and Medicaid-protected children.

I have begged for some consideration for Medicaid not only in the Committee on Rules, but in my home committee that my chairman has turned me

down several times on, but I know that I am right, Mr. Speaker, I know we must look out more for the poor children in this country through Medicaid, to be sure they get health protection and be sure that they are taken care of on Medicaid. We should be sure these nursing home standards stay. The Senate has at least guaranteed health care. Why can we not do it?

It is a situation now that nursing home reform did not just happen. We must keep it going. Our chairman must be sure and our ranking member must be sure that House Members are instructed to concur with the Senate recommendations. They have studied all this, the Committee on Commerce. Their committee has information which shows that there are certain States which will not be able to take care of their Medicaid patients if they were not to improve Medicare through the years it has taken this program to get as far as it is now.

Do you want to keep going? Do you want poor children to be handicapped by what we do in the House? Do you want the House to have that stigma? I do not. I am a Member of this proud House, I am a member of the Committee on the Budget. I know that we can do better by the children of this country.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct. Like the gentlewoman from Florida, [Mrs. MEEK], I spent a lot of time on the State legislature. I have served on the Committee on the Budget. I was chairman of the Committee on Health, Human Services and Aging for many years in the State Senate.

I can tell the Members that I had Governors tell me, other people tell me, "If we could just get the Federal Government off of our backs, we could do better, we will do better." This is a difference of philosophies here. We believe that there is a better way to do things for those children than is happening today. We believe in those children, and we want to help those children, but we do not think putting on burdens from the Federal Government time and time again and increasing costs as a result of duplicate regulations is the way to do it. We would be better, we think, in going back and to allow States to do that, and allow States to do it with a certain amount of regulation. There are some good things here and we are going to look at those, but we do not want to be tied into this particular type of instruction at this point on those things that relate to children.

There are some other things. We want to help pregnant women and children with disabilities. I think I have a good record of doing that. I think I will continue to do that.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], we are both friends and members of the Committee on the Budget. Would the gentleman believe that I would never have been admitted to a State university if it were left up to the State? Would he also believe I would never have received some of the benefits if it were left up to the State?

Mr. HOBSON. I would tell the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I would believe that. I think that was a number of years ago. I think the States have gotten better; maybe not Florida, I understand. I do not know about Florida. I could tell the Members about Ohio. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is laughing. Maybe he comes from a State where that is not true. In my State, that is true. I have until recently sat on the board of the oldest African-American university in the country, and on the board of the public school there, run by the State of Ohio. We have a good record. We have worked on it.

I am just saying we want to preserve these things, we want to do these things, and we are going to try to do that in the conference committee. We are going to do a number of issues where we will go in and we will work to try to get them better than what we have done here and they have done there, but we are not going to impose this particular restraint upon our conference committee at this point.

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

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], I think everybody respects the gentleman's stature in the House, but the truth of the matter is what we are doing is providing these block grants to the States and we are doing it with less money. Then what we are doing is eliminating standards, basic standards in terms of nursing home care, basic standards in terms of how we treat pregnant women, basic standards that go toward whether or not people can get the assurances.

The gentleman does not work for the State of Ohio any longer. He now works for the Federal Government. It does matter what happens in the State of Florida versus the State of Ohio. That is what we are doing.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would say to the gentleman, I do not work for the Federal Government. I work for the people of the Seventh Congressional District. I work for the people.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOBSON. The other inconsistency in the gentleman's statement is that we are not spending less money, we are spending more money. I know \$1 trillion is an increase that is difficult for the other side to understand, but that is what we are spending.

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

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in our Medigra Program, that 85 percent of all the money currently being spent on mandatory programs for women, children, disabled, is a provision that is contained in our bill. The interesting thing, though, is that 30 Governors across the States, 30 Governors across the country, have asked the Republicans to limit the rules and regulations and the dictates from Washington. Do Members know why? Because they are being required to comply with rules and regulations dictated by this city that get in the way of their ability to serve their needy population.

I will give one example. First of all, the Governors around this country have been begging bureaucrats in Washington to give them waivers to spend their people's money inside of their States to take care of their populations the way they see fit.

The Governor of Ohio believed if in fact he could have greater flexibility, he could not only attend to the poor population in the State of Ohio, but at the same time he could begin to cover people who do not have health care coverage. In fact, our Governor believes he can serve more people more effectively in the State of Ohio if he did not have to come down here on bended hands and knees to ask the bureaucrats, who do not even know what time zone we are in, as to whether he could deliver services to his own populations within the boundaries of the State of Ohio.

Frankly, I think the Governor of the State of Florida is a fine man, Lawton Chiles. He used to be a U.S. Senator. I do not believe Lawton Chiles will pass laws in the State of Florida that are not going to be designed to help the people of the State of Florida. It is really a matter of whether you have confidence in yourself, where you live. That philosophical point needs to be made here.

Mr. HOBSON. Let me say one thing about this, Mr. Speaker. The plan the gentleman is talking about is a plan that I worked on in the legislature with a Democratic Governor. It is called the Dayton area health plan. It started as a plan for ADC mothers and their children. That program had to come down here on bended knee to get an HCFA waiver in order to do that program for these people. It took months. We had to come back time and time again to do that program.

Right now as a matter of fact, in this bill is a provision extending that, because we are worried about a time factor on it. This Governor thought that the previous Democratic Governor did such a good job that that program is now, as John said, going statewide.

□ 1900

So the States can do things. The problem is, we want more money to go

back to the States; the gentleman wants to leave it all here with some bureaucrat here that we have to come down and fight with all of the time. We do not want to do that.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about State government. I spent 18 years in State government. The Federal Government at times frustrated me. There are rules and regulations that need revision, and we need to work on that.

I would have never dreamed of coming to the Federal Government and saying give me \$100 billion, no conditions. That is what we are doing in this bill. Nursing homes, Federal standards, go, forget about history, forget about history. Those standards came because the conditions were atrocious. Those of us in State government did not do our job, so we got the Federal standards. We did not just throw them out in the wake of history of why they were created, of dealing with the most vulnerable people in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the debate tonight is not about whether we have a balanced budget or not, or how it is done; the debate is really about who is going to carry the burden for this balanced budget. Is the product of the House and the product of the Senate the kind of product that we want to impose on the American public.

A great heavy vote in the House, a great heavy vote in the Senate have said no. Unfortunately, those votes were not quite enough to carry the day, but there were an awful lot of dissent in that. The President has said that he is going to veto what comes out of this effort that we are about to undertake of trying to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the question tonight is a very fundamental question, which is, who shall carry the burden of this balanced budget? How do we get there? Every time you look at any analysis, outside analysis of who carries the burden in all of this, the burden of this balanced budget comes down on the backs of the sick, the poor, the aged, children, and low-income working Americans.

Now, that is not fair. Let us take a for instance. Let us take the crown jewel, the tax cut. First of all, there is no need for a tax cut today. All of us know we have an unbalanced budget, and why add to the burden of balancing the budget by adding \$250 billion worth of tax cuts to it, particularly when you distribute the tax cuts as they are done.

Let us take probably the most expensive item in there, which is the so-many-dollars-per-child tax cut for families with children under 18 years of age. That is a very, very expensive program.



The first thing about it is that it is not \$500, as has been so widely advertised, but \$365. The second bad thing about the \$365 is that only the upper income people get it. The lower-income, working people do not get anything. In fact, 33 percent of all of the people in the United States with children in their family less than 18 years of age get absolutely nothing, not a penny. Another 10 percent get less than the \$365 that all of the upper income people get.

Now, that is not fair. If we were trying to balance this budget and to deliver a tax cut, we would never deliver a tax cut in that kind of manner.

With all of the other provisions in the tax bill, and the limited time does not permit me to go through all of the outrages that are in there, we would say, we can put this off, we will debate that at some other time, but let us get on with balancing the budget now. Let us get on with balancing the budget now. It we have to do something for those rich, political friends of my Republican colleagues over there, we will talk about that in a different time frame, a different environment than we are talking about now.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about balancing the budget; we are talking about who is going to pay for this balanced budget. The sick, the poor, the aged, children, and the working poor are paying for this balanced budget. That is unfair.

This motion to instruct the conferees should be adopted, and the whole thing should be rejected. We should go back to the very beginning and get this done right.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a philosophical difference, and I want to say that State government has changed since many of the Members came to this body; I think the State government was in trouble, and I think State government has improved dramatically.

In my State we had large institutions where we used to put the mentally ill. We reversed that, we changed that. Our State changed that. I think there is a different philosophical understanding between our two sides here. The Democratic side still thinks that the answer to everything is the Federal Government. We do not believe that.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have described my politics a little bit different. I describe myself as a liberal decentralist. There may not be that many of us around. The best memories of my life, the most fulfilling time of my life was the time I spent in State government.

On the other hand, fully understanding the capability of good State government, and most of them are good today, and they were 20 years ago.

Still, for States to come and say, we expect to have a blank check of \$100 billion, without the basic requirements that you take care of poor children and disabled people; that you throw out, with all the political pressures that exist, nursing home regulations, that is just crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to 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, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the world of my good friend from the State of Ohio, Mr. KASICH, but as much as I think of him, I do not think that he can perform the miracles of the loaves and the fishes, and that is what he is talking about doing.

What we are doing here is we are embarking on a process of saying that we are interested in balancing the budget of this country, which I am strongly in favor of and have been strongly in favor of for many years. What we ought not to do is balance the budget on the backs of the poorest, most vulnerable people in this country, and that is what this budget does.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] made a wonderful speech about reconciliation the other day, but reconciliation implies caring for the poor. It implies a conciliation, a sense that we are going to get together as a people, not pick on the vulnerable. This budget picks on the vulnerable.

All we are asking the House of Representatives and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who I am trying to have a conversation with, all we are trying to do is ask the gentleman to please pay attention to the Senate that is not picking on poor, vulnerable, pregnant women. We are just asking to please concede to the Senate in terms of cutting off pregnant women. We are asking to pay attention to the fact that when we say these Governors are going to be so careful in terms of their ability to provide these services at greater degrees than they do now for less money.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, I got a letter from 24 Governors saying that they wanted to get rid of the spousal impoverishment protections that are contained in the current law. They are doing that because the Republicans are cutting their programs so much that they need the flexibility to be able to cut off senior citizens, they need to be able to cut off elderly widows in order to be able to maintain the Republicans' sense of how to get to a balanced budget.

Why not go after the F-22? Why not go after the B-2 bomber? Why not go after some of the rich pork that is in this program, pork that exists in the budget of the United States that the Republicans side is unwilling to go after.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I did not know we were going to have to go back and start setting the facts straight again, but let me try.

In order to qualify for the Medicaid or the Medigiant program, the State will have to match just like they have. We are not going to take the money and spend it on something other than poor people. The question is, can the State of Ohio figure out how to spend it on poor people in their States better, better, than we have from here.

Let me just suggest to my dear friend from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, that the closest that we have come to eliminating the B-2 Bomber has been since the Republicans have taken control of the House. We could not get the votes, we could not get the votes to kill the B-2 Bomber when the Democrat majority was in charge.

Now we lost this probably by about 3 or 4 votes, and that is because, frankly, we got more Republicans than we have ever gotten before, and the simple fact of the matter is that we are the ones that have closed loopholes on large corporations. I mean the Puerto Rican 936 giveaway, the large pharmaceutical firms, the point is that we closed that loophole here in the first 9 months. It just took the Republicans about 9 months to close the loophole that corporations used on COLI, the Company Owned Life Insurance. The Democrats had 40 years to do it. We did it in 9 months.

Are there other improvements that need to be made? Dramatic improvements that need to be made. To argue, for example, that we are going to give Medigiant money to the States and they do not have to use it on poor people, that are not the facts. We have to have some semblance of facts to go with the statements.

I have already pointed out that 85 percent of all of the mandatory spending for women and children and the disabled have to continue to be spent, but the Governor of Ohio believes that if we give him the money that the people of Ohio sent to this city, and we give it back to him without all of the bureaucratic rules and regulations and red-tape, he will, with great compassion, take care of the poor and expand the program to take care of people who currently, many of the people who currently do not have health care coverage.

So I do not want to get into a tit-for-tat of what we are doing, but the simple fact of the matter is it is having confidence in people where we live. I have confidence in people where I live. I do not think I have to pass this on to people who live 500 miles away to solve my problem. I like to solve the problem in my neighborhood, entrusting the people who I live in the neighborhood with. That is what the program is all about.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].



Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, just a quick point of reference to a statement that was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] before. The gentleman said that he did not work for the Federal Government of the United States, that he worked for the people of the Seventh District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, we all come here based upon the district we represent, but what the gentleman suggested represents the very threat to the national principle that many of us on this side of the aisle are fearful of.

Mr. Speaker, let me call to specific attention tonight to the viewing audience an issue that I think that they ought to be concerned about. Last Friday the other body overwhelmingly removed a corporate pension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman will suspend for a reminder from the Chair that the gentleman will address his comments to the Chair and not the viewing audience.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most onerous provisions in this bill that is before us, and this motion to instruct corrects it, would take away, I think, an issue, if I might remind viewers of tonight, similar to the S&L issue when I first came here.

□ 1915

There is a threat to pensions across this country offered by this reconciliation proposal of the Republican Party. Simply put, their provision allows corporations to raid the pension funds of their hard-working employees.

We should not allow this to stand. Allowing corporations to use their excess pension funds is bad retirement policy, and pension funds would unnecessarily be put at risk. A corporation could take funds out of a pension fund that should be used to improve employee benefits. Some companies have excess current liability in their pension funds and cannot currently pay all of the benefits owed to their employees if the plan is terminated.

Ask yourself tonight what would happen if \$40 billion came out of the stock market tomorrow. That represents a real threat to the pensions of hard-working Americans. The PBGC could be faced with a bailout of pension funds that not only would lead to a taxpayer bailout but it would be the ghost of S&L past.

We can protect the pension funds of American workers, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] said, by taking this motion to instruct seriously and instructing the conferees to leave the pension benefits of hard-working Americans alone.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a major task. Our task is to get our financial house in order and balance our budget, and we are going to do it with the help of our colleagues on the other side or without it, but we are going to do our job.

I would just like to reemphasize the fact that my esteemed chairman has made a point of, and that is that we have only had eight months to deal with a problem that has existed for a long time. I readily agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that both Republicans and Democrats have their fingers in this problem that has existed with the deficits going higher and higher and higher.

The bottom line is, we had a Republican President, we had a Democratic Congress for much of that, and both sides simply could not agree. Republicans wanted to spend more on defense, and Democrats did not want to control the growth of entitlements, and they both agreed to disagree and end up with large deficits.

That was then, and this is now. Now is, we have a chance to deal with the problem. The way we are dealing with this problem is to slow the growth in spending so, ultimately, it intersects revenue seven years out. We are still going to have over a trillion dollar increase in our national debt, but it will not be \$3 trillion or it will not be \$2.5 trillion. We are going to slow that growth so, ultimately, in the seventh year, we have a balanced budget.

In the process, we are going to save our trust funds. Our trust funds are going bankrupt, particularly Social Security. It becomes insolvent next year. It goes bankrupt in 7 years. We are going to stretch that out so it does not go bankrupt in the year 2002. It is going to get up to the year 2010.

The third thing we are going to do, and the most important, is we are going to transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society. We know we have welfare that we focused attention on in the social side of our budget, but we also have corporate welfare as well that we are getting at, to the tune of \$29 billion. When I hear things about cutting and I know we are spending more, I just do not know how you can keep saying that.

The bottom line to this issue is that we hear comments about how we are cutting Medicare, and I know we are not cutting it. We are going to spend 73 percent more in the next 7 years than we did in the last seven. I know we are going to spend over \$674 billion additional in Medicare.

I also know, at the same time, that we do not have an increase in copayments. We do not have an increase in deductibles. I know the premium stays at 31.5 percent. It means the taxpayers are going to pay 68.5 percent; and as health care costs go up, as they have in the past, that 31.5 percent will go up as it has in the past.

I know we are not forcing people out of Medicare. They can stay where they are. They can get the traditional fee-for-service program they have gotten for the last 30 years. But if they want to, we have a plan that enables them to get private care and get better eye care or better dental care or maybe get a rebate, a refund in their premium, getting into the private sector plans. So I know we are not cutting Medicare. I know we are not cutting Medicaid.

Then I hear about school loans. School loans go up from \$24 billion this year to \$36 billion in the seventh year. I think about that, and I think only in this place and where the virus has spread, when you go from \$24 billion to \$36 billion in school loans, do people call that a cut.

What are we asking? We are saying that grace period that students will have to pay the interest when they get out of school for that next 6 months, that grace period, they are going to have to pay the interest. It amounts to \$9 more a month for those students who have borrowed \$17,000. So I am thinking, \$9 more a month, and that is a cut. We are going from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. Replete in our budget, time in, time out, we are spending more, but you call it a cut, and it is not a cut. It is an increase.

Bottom line, we are going to get our financial house in order, we are going to balance our budget, we are going to save our trust funds with or without your help, and we are going to transfer this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society. It would be nice to have your help, but if it is not there, we will just have to proceed on our own.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is always fun to remind my Republican colleagues that in the last Bush budget there was a deficit of \$290 billion. The budget deficit, having fallen 3 years running, is now down to a little over \$164 billion.

Think of that, my Republican colleagues. But I do not rise to talk about that. I rise to talk about something else. It is something which will not save a nickel of money for the taxpayers of the United States but which will do irresponsible and unlimited harm and hurt to one of the most helpless groups in our society. I refer to the nursing home patients. This bill absolutely does away with the nursing home protections for patients who are incarcerated in nursing homes.

In the 1980's our Committee on Oversight Investigations conducted a lengthy investigation of this. We found nursing home patients lying in their own human excrement, covered with bedsores. We found them tied to their beds. We found them drugged. We found their assets stolen. And we found them

impoverished improperly by raids upon their assets. We also found that they were in fire traps which burned, and they were burned to death in these fire traps. We found inadequate care. We found inadequate facilities. We found people who were not able to get the care they needed because there was neither an adequate number of employees nor properly qualified employees. These are the most helpless people in this country. We passed bipartisan legislation to do away with those abuses.

That bipartisan legislation is repealed by the legislation before us. This legislation is rich in hortatory language that, like the Tale of the Idiot in Shakespeare, is full of sound and fury but signifies nothing because it does nothing. It is long on hortatory language.

What this bill will do if the motion to instruct is not adopted is to return to those sad, unfortunate, unsavory days when the most helpless in our society were abused. That is the kind of legislation we have before us.

Adopt the motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the chairman of the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to come here to the floor and hear that the Democrats are going to present some rational arguments against what has been done and then listen to them come on the floor and emote.

The fact is that what we have heard in a couple of instances has been kind of interesting here this evening. For example, the talk about the fact that middle-income and low-income people are having their taxes increased. The fact is that what they are doing is basing that on a calculation with regard to the earned income tax credit. The earned income tax credit is actually going up under our plan over the next 7 years by 40 percent. There is going to be a massive increase in the amount of money that people are going to get. This is not taxes that they are having to pay. This is money that the Government takes and hands back to them. It is low-income people who actually get money handed to them through a check handed to them by the Government. That is going to go up 40 percent over the next 7 years under our plan and so the Democrats seem to think that that is a cut. It is just kind of interesting.

The other thing I am interested in hearing them talk about is pensions. It is fascinating to hear them come to the floor and hear them talk about how we are doing something to pensions when the fact is that the greatest danger to pensioners in this country is being done by this administration that is trying to take the pension money and sink it into public housing and other public projects. Under Secretary Reich, the Democrats have put forward a plan

that would have the money taken out of the pension plans and invested in high-risk, low-interest investments.

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

Mr. WALKER. I will not yield.

Mr. POMEROY. Your facts are not correct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. WALKER. I am not going to yield. I am going to make my statement. I have heard a lot of ridiculous talk.

The Democrats are doing a job on the pensioners of this country. Now what they have found is that Republicans actually want to try to reform the system and do something better for pension plans in this country and guess what? It is going to take money away from where they want to put money in for public housing. The Democrats have figured out that we are lowering the amount of money being put into social welfare in these budgets and now what they want to do is they want to raid the pension funds and they have figured out that under our plans they are not going to be able to raid those pension funds for social welfare spending. It is absolutely amazing to hear what we are hearing on the floor tonight. The fact is the real danger is the social welfare philosophy of the Democrats.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is dead wrong. We increased the earned income tax credit last year. You are cutting it. You are raiding the employees trust funds, taking pension assets out of them.

Your characterization of what the President and others have suggested on pension funds is total distortion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me also compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing that up and if he would look at what Secretary Reich has said.

That bill that we passed here, there is no mandate from the Department of Labor on any of those investments in housing. But the argument should be I would rather them invest in housing here than in Beirut, Lebanon where some of them may get the same rate of return they would instead of downtown Houston.

I rise tonight to support the motion to instruct. I support a balanced budget but not the effort that the majority is trying to do. It is ironic that our Speaker and supporters approved this budget plan just a few days before Halloween and here we are going to have it tomorrow.

When one looks at the facts, it is clear that their budget and their rhetoric are the ones that are scaring the American people. They are scaring seniors on Medicare, college students and

the workers who are depending on those pensions instead of this raid on the pension plans.

Perhaps the single biggest trick is that the Republicans are cutting Medicare by \$270 billion in order to pay for the \$245 billion budget-busting tax cut.

The fact is that Medicare is cut to pay for tax cuts is highlighted by the Medicare cuts are 3 times greater than what the Medicare trustees have said they needed to do to ensure Medicare solvency to the year 2006.

If you do not think that is scary enough, listen to this from a distinguished Member from the other body:

I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, 1 out of about 12 because we knew it would not work in 1965.

And from a Member of our own body: "Now we don't get rid of it," that is being the Medicare they are trying to save supposedly, "in round one because we don't think that's politically smart and we don't think it's the right way to go through a transition period. But we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it."

Voluntarily leave Medicare? The budget plan will force seniors out of Medicare. That is not voluntary. It is forcing them out.

The promises from the Republicans to strengthen and preserve Medicare are scary Halloween tricks on senior citizens.

Let me remind Members what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] said, that in 1990 we had a \$290 billion deficit on a yearly basis. This last year without one Republican vote we had \$164 billion.

□ 1930

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out again, under our plan, EITC goes up by 40 percent. The gentleman from Minnesota seems to think that is a cut. A 40-percent increase seems to me to be a pretty good increase.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. No. I am going to make my statement.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to just—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. RIGGS] The gentleman from Pennsylvania will suspend so the Chair can get order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman yields for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KASICH. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Under the rules of the House, is the Speaker supposed to maintain order in here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; the Speaker is to maintain order in the House at all times, and the Speaker will remind Members that the gentleman from Pennsylvania controls the time, and the House will proceed under regular order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his parliamentary inquiry.

I just wanted to also point out, I come back and say exactly the point again, that the President has issued an Executive order. Secretary Reich is in the process of implementing the Executive order that is designed to raid the pension system of this country, and take money out of productive investments where that money can actually earn real money and put it into public housing. I think the workers of this country would be absolutely appalled if they understood what this administration is about to do, and that is take their money out of places where it is actually leading to productive investment in the country and going into public housing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to correct some absolute misstatements by the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The administration has proposed nothing that involves the use of pension in any high risk venture. Nothing has been proposed in that respect.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Is public housing a high risk investment?

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I will explain it to you, so listen. No investment may be used unless it is equal in return and risk to any other investment to be made by a prudent investor. That is the only standard of consideration by the Treasury Department.

Let me proceed with what has been proposed in the budget that every member of the majority, with a few exceptions, voted for: a raid on pension plans that has been estimated to bring in 40, that has been estimated to allow \$40 billion in pension fund assets to fly out of pension funds. During the 1980's we saw pension funds being used to finance hostile takeovers of corporations. It was the money of the pensioners that was used to finance these pensioners.

On three different occasions Congress enacted safeguards so this could never happen again. Without a hearing, Ways and Means removes all of those safeguards for a windfall window for corporations to make a pension grab up until July 1, 1996, and a 6.5-percent penalty thereafter.

What will happen is one of three scenarios: Hostile takeovers kick in again, they raid the corporations, they use the workers' pension funds to finance the takeover; second scenario, a cor-

poration wanting to fend off a hostile takeover, caring about their workers but wanting to fend off a hostile takeover, has to take out of the pension funds to remove themselves as a target; or, third, a corporation that is in financial trouble begins to dip in the cookie jar, the pension funds reserved for the workers.

I know about this. I for 8 years regulated the solvency of insurance companies. I am the only Member of this body that has spent 8 years regulating solvency. This is a solvency protection issue. It goes at the heart of the pension security of millions of working men and women across this country.

When this came before the floor of the Senate, in their budget debate, they rejected this ill-thought-out proposal by a vote of 95 to 4.

We urge this body to approve this and yield to the Senate position, restore worker pension security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this point in the debate, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 8 minutes 50 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge support for the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Let me point out to my colleagues on the other side that all this motion does is to ask the conferees to recede to the Senate position on the pension reversions. So essentially what we are saying is these pension provisions in the House bill are not wise, and the Senate, to their credit, has essentially said they are not wise, and that was done by the majority party. I think that is a recognition of the fact that the concerns that we have over the pension provisions in the House bill are real and, therefore, the conferees should listen to what the Senate has done because of their concern.

I just wanted to go back and point out from the very beginning that the reason why I support this motion to instruct is primarily because it recognizes the fact that we should not destroy Medicare by providing tax cuts for the wealthy. What the motion said is that we can provide more money for Medicare, more money for Medicaid if we simply decrease the amount of tax cuts that are going for wealthy Americans. At the same time the motion also says do not increase taxes on poor people. The earned income tax credit, which has been the subject of much of the debate here today, put more money back into the earned income tax credit, the way the current law would provide, so that we do not have a higher tax in this budget bill on poor people; the same thing with regard to Medicare part B. Medicare part B is doubled in this legislation.

Let us avoid some of those increases. Let us avoid taxing poor people or poor

elderly or elderly in general, who cannot afford to pay for that tax increase.

The other recognition I think that in this motion to instruct is that a lot of people may simply not get health coverage, may not have access to health care because of what is in this legislation, low-income seniors who no longer will be eligible for part B and have their Medicare part B premiums paid, States that may decide they are not going to provide the guarantee of Medicaid coverage in certain categories.

I urge support for the motion. It makes sense and takes away from some of the terrible things that are in this bill that are passed last week in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] that he has the right to close the debate.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado. [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is very simple, what we are talking about. We are talking about "wreckconciliation" and we have a little bit of progress tonight if we pass this motion to instruct.

If we do not pass this motion to instruct, we are going to wreck all of the regulations dealing with nursing homes. We are going to wreck the fact that Medicaid goes for women, children and disabled, and we are going to wreck the pension part.

The other body voted on these very strongly, and all we are saying to our side is, please, please go along with the Senate on what they strongly voted on.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman mentioned pension. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the preposterous statement we are putting pension money into public housing. That is, of course, literally impossible. Public housing is wholly public funding. What he may be talking about, and I have to say on this issue, if a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quite safe, because he has none whatsoever.

This House voted, with support of Republicans on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to allow building trades to invest their own pension funds in housing, not public housing but assisted housing, which would help build housing and help their jobs. Some of those projects have already been built. He made that argument before; he was repudiated by the Republicans on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, as well as over two-thirds of the House.

Some of that has been done, and there is not any evidence whatsoever that anybody is trying to put any money into public housing. It is a matter that involves poor people and so,

therefore, it is one he is not familiar with.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct. I think we ought to listen to that, because not only the vote in the Senate was 95 Senators agreed with the gentleman from Massachusetts and everyone else. So if you do not want your pension wrecked, if you do not want to do away with standards for nursing homes, and if you do not want to undercut Medicaid benefits for the disabled and low-income women and children, vote "yes" on this motion to instruct. It is time we show we have a heart larger than a swollen pea.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I do understand the emotional attachment that some in the House have towards believing that the only way to solve problems in this country is to send more money and influence and power to people in this city.

What I am a little mystified about is the fact that our philosophy simply is this: We think that if we send or if we keep our money and our power and influence and we invest it in our neighbors, our friends, our families, our local elected officials, that they frankly are capable of showing as much or more compassion than those folks who have been vested, with money, power and influence in this city.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, if in fact we do not return power and money and influence back to our local communities, then in fact the country is on a road towards bankruptcy. I would say that the Democratic side here has made some legitimate points tonight that we, in fact, will consider in the conference. The conference is a matter of being able to take the provisions that we have passed in this body, to be able to sit down with those in the other body and work out the big picture in terms of what best is going to help solve the problems of this country.

As I have already pointed out, our Medicaid plan already has a requirement that 85 percent of all the mandatory spending that affects the children and the poor and the disabled be maintained, that a State match be maintained, and we are going to continue to have discussions in areas where we have some disagreement. But at the end of the day, we are going to pass a plan that gives increased flexibility, more money on entitlement programs, not less, more money on entitlement programs, and restores a big part of common sense. It is about the pendulum coming back from too many rules being dictated here to more decisions being made at the local level.

I would ask my colleagues to allow us to maintain this, the flexibility, as we go to the conference, reject the specific motion to instruct conferees, allow us to get on with our job. Within the period of hopefully 2 weeks, we will all be back up here with a wrapped-up

reconciliation bill that will in fact accomplish our objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some sounds of reasonableness from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and from a few others. But we have also heard tonight some notes of meanness.

Let me say a word about the pension issue, for example. Look, the Democrats have not asked that any fund be able to spend this money for public housing, as stated. All we have said is let management-labor trust funds spend money within the industry in which they labor, and we have said to you, do not let employers take back money that employees earned for their pensions. That is what we have said.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means, and why was the \$40 billion proposed? In order to raise \$10 billion in taxes.

I think it is mean to steal pension money from people who worked for it in order to pay for a tax cut for very wealthy Americans.

□ 1945

Let me say just a word about this corporate welfare suggestion to the gentleman from Connecticut. Look, there is not an attack on corporate welfare here. Sixty-nine percent of this is EITC pension and low income housing credit programs. EITC is not giving money back to people. They worked for it. It is not the government's money. Now some are proposing to reduce it.

What we are trying to do through this motion is to bring some common sense to this process, and to take America back from the extremism that we have brought to these deliberations.

Vote for this motion to instruct. The Senate did better, but we have to send a message to the House and Senate conferees: Do not listen to the extremism in this budget. Vote for this motion to instruct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 219, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 744]

#### AYES—198

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

#### NOES—219

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

Goss	LoBiondo	Salmon
Graham	Longley	Sanford
Greenwood	Lucas	Saxton
Gunderson	Manzullo	Scarborough
Gutknecht	Martini	Schaefer
Hancock	McCollum	Schiff
Hastert	McCrery	Seastrand
Hastings (WA)	McDade	Sensenbrenner
Hayworth	McIntosh	Shadegg
Hefley	McKeon	Shaw
Heineman	Metcalf	Shays
Herger	Meyers	Shuster
Hilleary	Mica	Skeen
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hoekstra	Molinar	Smith (NJ)
Hoke	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Horn	Morella	Smith (WA)
Hostettler	Myers	Souder
Houghton	Myrick	Spence
Hunter	Nethercutt	Stearns
Hutchinson	Neumann	Stockman
Hyde	Ney	Stump
Inglis	Norwood	Talent
Istook	Nussle	Tate
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Tauzin
Jones	Packard	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Parker	Thomas
Kelly	Paxon	Thornberry
Kim	Petri	Tiahrt
King	Pombo	Upton
Kingston	Porter	Vucanovich
Klug	Portman	Waldholtz
Knollenberg	Pryce	Walker
Kolbe	Quillen	Walsh
LaHood	Quinn	Wamp
Largent	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Latham	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Regula	Weller
Laughlin	Riggs	White
Lazio	Roberts	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Linder	Roth	Zeliff
Livingston	Royce	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Chapman	Hansen	Solomon
Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	Weldon (PA)
Ford	McHugh	Young (FL)

□ 2005

Ms. WATERS, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from "no" to "aye".

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The CHAIR wishes to announce that it will appoint conferees to the House-Senate budget reconciliation conference after the next vote.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-298) on the resolution (H. Res. 249) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359.

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

There was no objection.

## SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 247.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.R. 247, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 103, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 745]

YEAS—315

Abercrombie	Combest	Ganske
Allard	Condit	Gekas
Andrews	Cooley	Geren
Archer	Costello	Gilchrest
Armey	Cox	Gillmor
Bachus	Cramer	Gilman
Baesler	Crane	Gonzalez
Baker (CA)	Crapo	Goodlatte
Baker (LA)	Creameans	Goodling
Baldacci	Cubin	Gordon
Ballenger	Cunningham	Goss
Barcia	Danner	Graham
Barr	Davis	Green
Barrett (NE)	de la Garza	Greenwood
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Gunderson
Bartlett	DeFazio	Gutknecht
Barton	DeLay	Hall (TX)
Bass	Deutsch	Hancock
Bateman	Diaz-Balart	Harman
Bentsen	Dickey	Hastert
Bereuter	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Bevill	Doolittle	Hayes
Bilbray	Dornan	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Doyle	Hefley
Bliley	Dreier	Hefner
Blute	Duncan	Heineman
Boehlert	Dunn	Herger
Boehner	Durbin	Hilleary
Bonilla	Edwards	Hinchey
Bono	Ehlers	Hobson
Boucher	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Brewster	Emerson	Hoke
Browder	English	Holden
Brownback	Ensign	Horn
Bryant (TN)	Eshoo	Hostettler
Bryant (TX)	Evans	Hunter
Bunn	Everett	Hutchinson
Bunning	Ewing	Hyde
Burr	Farr	Inglis
Burton	Fawell	Istook
Buyer	Fields (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Callahan	Filner	Jacobs
Calvert	Flanagan	Jefferson
Camp	Foley	Johnson (SD)
Canady	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Fowler	Jones
Chabot	Fox	Kaptur
Chambliss	Frank (MA)	Kasich
Chenoweth	Franks (CT)	Kelly
Christensen	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy (MA)
Chrystler	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (RI)
Coble	Frisa	Kim
Coburn	Funderburk	Kingston
Collins (GA)	Furse	Klecicka
Collins (IL)	Gallegly	Klink

Klug	Knollenberg	Neal
Kolbe	Kolbe	Nethercutt
LaHood	LaHood	Neumann
Largent	Largent	Ney
Latham	Latham	Norwood
LaTourette	LaTourette	Nussle
Laughlin	Laughlin	Ortiz
Lazio	Lazio	Orton
Leach	Leach	Oxley
Lewis (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Packard
Lewis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Pallone
Lightfoot	Lightfoot	Parker
Lincoln	Lincoln	Paxon
Linder	Linder	Payne (VA)
Livingston	Livingston	Peterson (MN)
	Lipinski	Petri
	Livingston	Pombo
	LoBiondo	Porter
	Lofgren	Portman
	Longley	Poshard
	Lucas	Pryce
	Luther	Quillen
	Manton	Quinn
	Manzullo	Radanovich
	Markey	Ramstad
	Martini	Reed
	Mascara	Regula
	McCollum	Riggs
	McCrery	Rivers
	McDade	Roberts
	McHale	Roemer
	McIntosh	Rogers
	McKeon	Rohrabacher
	McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen
	Meehan	Rose
	Menendez	Roth
	Metcalf	Roukema
	Meyers	Royce
	Mica	Salmon
	Miller (CA)	Sanford
	Miller (FL)	Saxton
	Minge	Scarborough
	Mink	Schaefer
	Moakley	Schiff
	Molinar	Schroeder
	Montgomery	Schumer
	Moorhead	Seastrand
	Morella	Sensenbrenner
	Myers	Shadegg
	Myrick	Shaw

## NAYS—103

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Becerra	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Beilenson	Houghton	Rahall
Berman	Hoyer	Rangel
Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Borski	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kennelly	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Sanders
Cardin	King	Sawyer
Clay	LaFalce	Scott
Clayton	Lantos	Serrano
Clement	Levin	Sisisky
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coleman	Lowey	Slaughter
Collins (MI)	Maloney	Stokes
Conyers	Martinez	Studds
Coyne	Matsui	Thompson
DeLauro	McCarthy	Thornton
Dellums	McDermott	Torres
Dicks	McKinney	Torricelli
Dingell	Meek	Towns
Dixon	Mfume	Velazquez
Dooley	Mollohan	Vento
Engel	Moran	Visclosky
Fattah	Murtha	Volkmer
Fazio	Nadler	Ward
Flake	Oberstar	Waters
Foglietta	Obey	Watt (NC)
Frost	Olver	Waxman
Gejdenson	Owens	Wilson
Gephardt	Pastor	Wynn
Gibbons	Payne (NJ)	Yates
Gutierrez	Pelosi	
Hamilton	Peterson (FL)	

## NOT VOTING—14

Bishop	Hall (OH)	Smith (TX)
Chapman	Hansen	Tucker
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	McHugh	Young (FL)
Ford	McInnis	