

## NOT VOTING—20

Bateman	Davis	Klecza
Berman	Dornan	Lipinski
Bono	Fattah	Pelosi
Borski	Flake	Riggs
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Schumer
Chapman	Hoyer	Vucanovich
Collins (IL)	Johnston	

□ 1216

Messrs. WELDON of Pennsylvania, SERRANO, and WELDON of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 149 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 149

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. General debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed six hours (including one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies) equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those designated in section 2 of this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by a Member designated, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments designated in section 2 are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments

thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. The following amendments are in order pursuant to the first section of this resolution:

(1) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Gephardt of Missouri printed not later than May 16, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII, if proposing a Congressional budget in which total outlays for the fiscal year 2002 do not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year.

(2) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Neumann of Wisconsin or Representative Solomon of New York consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 66.

(3) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Payne of New Jersey or Representative Owens of New York printed by Representative Payne on May 16, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII.

(4) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by the minority leader or a designee printed by him not later than May 17, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII, if proposing a Congressional budget based on a revised budget submission by the President to the Congress in which total outlays for the fiscal year 2002 do not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year.

SEC. 3. Rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

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

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today is a truly historic day in this Chamber and one that I personally have waited for for a long time, because this will be the first time that this Congress will actually debate how to balance a budget instead of whether we will balance the budget at all.

Why is this so? Because we have written the rules of this debate so that only four alternatives can be offered, and all four alternatives, ladies and gentlemen, balance the budget. Can you believe that? That, ladies and gentlemen, is truly historic. So much so that I am so excited I really can hardly stand it.

Mr. Speaker, let me get to the text of the rule itself, and Members should lis-

ten because it is a complicated, complex rule.

House Resolution 149 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1996 through the year 2002. The rule provides for 6 hours of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Budget, including 1 hour of debate on the so-called Humphrey-Hawkins legislation economic goals and policies. All points of order are waived against the budget resolution and its consideration.

This rule provides for the adoption in the House and in the Committee of the Whole of an amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report relating to spending on agriculture programs, and for those Members who might not come from agricultural districts, they might listen to this too. This is a sense-of-Congress provision to reconsider spending reductions in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 if certain conditions are not met. This amendment is language worked out between the Committee on Agriculture chairman and the leadership to ensure that spending reductions for agricultural programs do not have an adverse impact on the farm economy, and that is very important.

This rule makes in order four amendments in the nature of substitutes, subject to 1 hour of debate each, and waives points of order against them, except that it does not allow for the consideration of subsequent substitutes if any one substitute is adopted.

Before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, this is the most important part of my statement, Mr. Speaker, that provision in the rule means quite simply that there are no free votes on this budget resolution coming up. The adoption of any substitute will bring the House to a vote on final adoption of the budget resolution as amended, immediately.

This is the old-fashioned amendment process, it is not a king-of-the-hill or so-called queen-of-the-hill process. The four substitutes in their order of consideration are important, because if any one of these pass, then the debate immediately ceases and we go right to final passage. The first substitute to be offered will be an amendment by Representative GEPHARDT printed in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is the text of the so-called coalition budget. That is the first substitute before us.

Second, a substitute to be offered by Representatives NEUMANN and SOLOMON, that is myself, consisting of House Concurrent Resolution 66, which you all have before you. This achieves a balanced budget by the fiscal year 2000, that is within 5 years.

Third, a substitute by Representative PAYNE of New Jersey and Representative OWENS of my State of New York printed in yesterday's RECORD, that is the Black Caucus budget.

And fourth, and this is important, an amendment printed in the RECORD by

today by the minority leader or his designee consisting of a revised Presidential budget, if it achieves a balanced budget by the year 2002. We give the President of the United States 7 years to bring our deficits into balance, and we are waiting with anticipation for the President to join in this debate and offer that amendment.

Following the disposition of amendments, the rule allows for an additional 10 minutes of debate divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Finally, and this is also important to Members of the House, the rule suspends for 1 year the application of House Rule XLIX, the so-called Gephardt rule on the debt limit.

What that means is that this House will be forced to conduct a separate vote on raising the debt limit later this year rather than having it automatically adopted upon the adoption of the budget resolution's conference report. There is no free ride there, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to put our name on the line.

This is a fair rule that provides ample opportunity for the major alternatives to be debated and voted on. While we did not make in order all of the amendments presented to the Committee on Rules, I think most objective observers, including the press, will agree we have allowed for the debate to be framed in a very fair and open manner that allows for the most serious alternatives having substantial support to be offered and voted on.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I commend the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], for agreeing to offer a major substitute even though he does not support it, according to this morning's papers. It was not offered by him or by the majority of his caucus. Nevertheless, it is a Democrat position, and it will be interesting to see where the votes fall on that.

It was our feeling that, as important as the budget resolution is, and it clearly is one of the most defining acts of a political party, that the rule should allow for a leadership-backed alternative from both sides of the aisle. Where do we stand on the issues? That is what needs to be debated on this floor today.

In addition, we have given the President, as I said, an additional 2 days beyond our Monday deadline to submit a revised budget plan that would achieve a balanced budget.

Now, Members of the House, you may recall that back on May 9 I wrote to the President's chief of staff, Mr. Panetta, the former chairman of the Committee on the Budget, inviting him on behalf of the Republican leadership, to submit a balanced budget to the Committee on Rules by last Monday, and we would make it in order. Even

though Mr. Clinton promised early in his Presidential campaign, and we have got the quotes from his campaign which we will read to you today during the debate, to balance the budget, his latest budget shows deficits remaining at the \$200 billion mark into the next century. I ask you, what kind of balancing act is that? One trillion dollars added to the deficit over the next 7 years.

Now, we hear Mr. Panetta in this morning's paper and on "Good Morning, America," this morning criticizing us for establishing an arbitrary date of fiscal year 2002 for balancing the budget. And yet last January we voted on six constitutional amendments requiring balanced budgets, four by Democrats and two by Republicans. The Committee on Rules did not require that they provide for a balanced budget by 2002. We did not set any arbitrary date, and yet every one of those amendments that came to this floor, Democrat or Republican, did just that. Of the four Democrat substitutes, the Owens of New York Democrat substitute was supported by 62 Democrats. You ought to add up these numbers as I read them off to you. The Wise of West Virginia substitute, another Democrat substitute, was supported by 136 Democrats. The Conyers Democrat substitute was backed by 112 Democrats. And then finally, the Gephardt/Bonior substitute was favored by 130 Democrats.

Moreover, on final passage of the constitutional amendment, 72 Democrats voted in favor of it, and the vote was 300 to 132. Nearly 70 percent of this House voted for that date certain—the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up all the Democrats who supported one substitute or another and called for a balanced budget by 2002, you find that 187 Democrats, or 92 percent of those on their side of the aisle, voted for a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002.

That is what is on the floor today, and yet the President and his chief of staff would have us believe that there is something arbitrary, something unrealistic about setting a fiscal year 2002 deadline for balancing this budget.

Even the Senate minority leader has said the President is wrong on that account. That was Mr. DASCHLE over in the other body, on "Good Morning, America." Go and replay it back and see what he had to say.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Democrat Members suggested at our hearing yesterday that I smiled to myself when I consider how things have shifted in just the last year toward support for a real balanced budget in this Congress and in this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that I really am proud to smile publicly that we have come so far in such a short, short time. The American people have spoken, and we are listening, finally, to their cries to save this country and to save our chil-

dren and to save our grandchildren from economic and financial ruin, because that is where we have been going.

We witnessed a tidal wave for change at the polls last November, and, Mr. Speaker, if we do not follow through by keeping our commitment to bringing this Government and this country back into the black, then we will drown in another tidal wave. It will be a tidal wave of red ink that will engulf us and future generations to come. It will destroy this Nation.

Last January, 187 Democrats and 228 Republicans voted for at least one of the constitutional amendments offered that called for balancing the budget by fiscal year 2002. That is a total of 415 Members out of 435 Members of this House. Think about that, 95 percent of the Members of this House of Representatives supporting a balanced budget.

Today that support for a lofty and noble goal confronts the reality of making the tough choices to achieve the goal of restoring this country to a condition of fiscal sanity, of soundness and stability. Members, we will have the good intentions of last January tested by our willingness, indeed by our intestinal and political fortitude, to vote for the balanced budget we said was needed 4 months ago. Today is your opportunity, Mr. Speaker and Members. We can either follow through on our commitment to setting things straight and right, or we can cave, we can crumble at the sound of Chicken Little clucking, he who would have us believe that the world is going to come to an end if we dare to do what the American people have to do, what business and industry have to do, and that is to live within our means.

Mr. Speaker, today is the defining moment for this Congress and this country as we face the 21st century. It is right around the corner. We may never have another moment like this if we cling to the past, if we deny our children, if we deny our grandchildren and those not even born yet a promising and prosperous future.

We must put an end to this terrible debt burden that is dragging us down and denying us the opportunity to confront the new century with renewed hope, with renewed opportunity.

Confronting and conquering great challenges is what this country is all about and what we as Representatives of the people should be all about. Let us not shrink from that challenge.

I want Members to support this rule. I want Members to support a balanced budget plan that will bring a brighter tomorrow, regardless of which one of these four balanced budgets comes to a final vote. That is the one we have got to vote for in the end. We have got to do it for America.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following document for the RECORD:

## DEBATE &amp; AMENDMENTS ON HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTIONS, 1989-1994

Year	Budget res.	Rule number	General debate time (hours)	Amendments allowed	Vote on rule	Total time consumed <sup>1</sup> (hours)
1989	H. Con. Res. 106	H. Res. 145 <sup>2</sup>	5-hours (2 HH)	5 (3-D; 2-R)	Adopted: voice	12½
1990	H. Con. Res. 310	H. Res. 382 <sup>3</sup>	6-hours (3 HH)	4 (1-D; 3-R)	Adopted: voice	13
1991	H. Con. Res. 121	H. Res. 123 <sup>4</sup>	5-hours (2 HH)	4 (1-D; 3-R)	Adopted: 392-9	11
1992	H. Con. Res. 287	H. Res. 386 <sup>5</sup>	3-hours (1 HH)	3 (1-D; 2-R)	Adopted: 239-182	13½
1993	H. Con. Res. 64	H. Res. 131	10-hours (4 HH)		Adopted: voice	16
		H. Res. 133 <sup>6</sup>		4 (2-D; 2-R)	Adopted: 251-172	
1994	H. Con. Res. 218	H. Res. 384 <sup>7</sup>	4-hours (1 HH)	5 (3-D; 2-R)	Adopted: 245-171	10

<sup>1</sup> Includes hour on rule, general debate time, and debate time on all amendments, but does not include time taken on rollcall votes and walking-around time.

<sup>2</sup> Of the 5 amendments, one was an amendment by the Chairman of the Budget Committee (30-minutes), followed by 4 substitutes under king-of-the-hill procedure: Dannemeyer (1-hr.); Dellums (3-hrs.); Kasich (1-hr.); Gephardt (1-hr.).

<sup>3</sup> General debate began on April 25th under a unanimous consent request agreed to on April 24th. Four substitute amendments were allowed under king-of-the-hill procedures: Kasich (1-hr.); Dannemeyer (1-hr.); Dellums (2-hrs.); and Frenzel (2-hrs.).

<sup>4</sup> Of the 4 amendments allowed, one was a perfecting amendment by Rep. Ford of Michigan (1-hr.), followed by 3 substitutes under king-of-the-hill: Dannemeyer (1-hr.); Kasich (1-hr.); and Gradison (2-hrs.).

<sup>5</sup> Three substitutes were allowed under king-of-the-hill: Dannemeyer (30-mins.); Gradison (1-hr.); and Towns-Dellums (8-hrs.).

<sup>6</sup> Of the 10-hours of general debate, 2-hours were allocated to the Budget Committee; 4-hours for Humphrey-Hawkins; 2-hours to discuss the Mfume substitute; and 1-hour to discuss the Solomon substitute. This was followed by 4 substitutes under king-of-the-hill: Kasich (2-hrs.); Solomon (1-hr.); Mfume (1-hr.); and Sabo (identical to base resolution, 1-hr.).

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the hour on Humphrey-Hawkins, Reps. Kasich and Mfume each were given one hour of general debate to discuss their substitutes. Five substitutes were allowed under king-of-the-hill subject to one-hour of debate each, with the last being identical to the reported budget resolution.

Source: Rules Committee Calendars (Note: HH stands for Humphrey-Hawkins debate).

## TIMING OF HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTIONS, 1989-1994

Year	Budget res.	Date ordered reported	Date re-reported filed	Date rule granted	Date House took-up BR	Days report available <sup>1</sup>
1989	H. Con. Res. 106	4/27/89	5/2/89	5/2/89	5/3/89	1
1990	H. Con. Res. 310	4/19/90	4/23/90	4/25/90	4/25/90	2
1991	H. Con. Res. 121	4/9/91	4/12/91	4/15/91	4/16/91	4
1992	H. Con. Res. 287	2/27/92	3/2/92	3/3/92	3/4/92	2
1993	H. Con. Res. 64	3/10/93	3/15/93	3/16/93	3/17/93	2
1994	H. Con. Res. 218	3/3/94	3/8/94	3/9/94	3/10/94	2

<sup>1</sup> Days of report availability assumes report was available on the day after it was filed and includes the day on which the budget resolution was taken up by the House.

<sup>2</sup> General debate begun by unanimous consent; rule was adopted the following day.

Sources: House Calendars; H.J.S.; Congressional Quarterly Almanacs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this budget resolution shows the American people that Republicans can offer balanced budgets. The debate we are beginning here in the House today is not whether we balance the Federal budget, but rather, how. And it is how Republicans want to balance the budget that should be the focus of our debate today.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal to balance the Federal budget contains \$350 billion in tax cuts. These tax cuts will amount to \$20,000 per person for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. At the same time this budget is handing the most fortunate in our society a sizeable tax break, the Republican budget is asking the rest of the country to swallow unnecessarily large cuts in programs such as Medicare and student loans.

In order to make these cuts and to finance this subsidy for the wealthiest of our citizens, Medicare recipients will pay an additional \$1,000 a year more for their health care by the year 2002. When we think of that extra \$1,000, we should remember that 83 percent of Medicare benefits go to seniors with incomes of \$25,000 or less.

Not only will Medicare recipients pay more, hospitals will bear an unfair burden. The President and CEO of the Navarro Regional Hospital in my congressional district, Harvey Fishero, wrote to me this week to express his deep concerns about Medicare and Medicaid cuts envisioned in the Republican budget. He said, and I quote, "Medicare and Medicaid targets set by the Budget Committee are unacceptable, unsustainable and must be lowered. These reductions are much too severe

and are implemented too fast for the Medicare system to handle." He says that by the year 2000, Medicare PPS operating margins would fall to -20.6 percent and hospitals would lose \$1,300 in PPS payments for every Medicare recipient.

Republicans will try to deny that young Americans may be forced to forgo the dream of a college education because this budget will increase the costs of college loans. It is estimated that because of the elimination of the in-school interest subsidy envisioned in the Republican budget, students may pay up to \$5,000 more for their college loans. And, when we think of recipients of guaranteed student loans, we should remember that the average family income of students receiving these subsidies is \$35,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget is right here in black and white. Glib explanations of slowing growth and block grants and saving programs cannot explain away \$350 billion in tax cuts. Those explanations cannot make what is printed on these pages go away. They cannot explain why this budget asks those who are least able to contribute the most.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues spent a good deal of their time in the Rules Committee yesterday asking for alternatives. They were asking for these alternatives while three alternatives had already been submitted for the committee's consideration. One of those alternatives, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, was made in order by this resolution. Another, offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], was not. Both of those proposals

presented the committee with serious policy alternatives to the Republican budget.

A third alternative was also submitted to the Rules Committee. That proposal was developed on behalf of the conservative wing of the Democratic party by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]. That proposal presented the committee with a very viable alternative to the Republican budget. The major difference between the Orton-Stenholm budget and the Republican budget goes back to the basic question of how do we balance the Federal budget. The Orton-Stenholm proposal recognizes that cutting taxes and balancing the budget might present a fundamental conflict. Yet, it seemed for much of the day yesterday this alternative would not be made in order.

This alternative will, however, be considered by the House. But it will be considered only because the Democratic leader, Mr. GEPHARDT will offer it, not because its authors were given the opportunity to offer their proposal in their own right. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that had Mr. GEPHARDT not agreed to put his name on this alternative, the House would have been denied the opportunity to consider a very responsible Democratic budget alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I have many requests for time today, so I will conclude. But, I must register my opposition to this rule. Mr. ORTON and Mr. STENHOLM have been shortchanged by this rule as has Mr. DINGELL. And, because they have been shortchanged, so have the American people. I believe the American people want and deserve better than what this resolution gives them.

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

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would just say I think the gentleman knows I have a good working relationship with the Democrat coalition. I have been negotiating with them several days. Much of what you said, though, just is not true because the gentleman does not know the details of the negotiations that went on. I assure you that we would have taken care of them. We just wanted the Democrat leadership to present an alternative that he would vote for. It will be interesting to see if he does.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], one of the very distinguished members of the Committee on Rules; he has been invaluable in developing the balanced budget concept for many years on this floor, and he is one of the most respected Members.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time. I commend him for this extraordinarily fair rule on this vital issue, and, of course, I also have to commend him for his brilliant substitute with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] that we will be discussing.

By sticking to the announced parameters that the only substitutes allowed will be those that bring the budget into balance by 2002, this rule ensures that we move beyond the question of if we balance our books within 7 years to how we will reach that goal. And that is truly a remarkable turnabout from the years past.

Still, of course, we have the liberal naysayers who seem to prefer the status quo. The impact of the status quo is really letting the ship of state sail full speed ahead into the rocky cliffs of certain bankruptcy for certain programs, as we know, and, I believe, fiscal calamity for our children and grandchildren, and as a grandfather, that is not responsible.

□ 1245

As a grandfather, that is not responsible. I am still amazed that the President has refused to join this effort and has abdicated all responsibility for mapping out a strategy to bring our budget into balance within the specified period of time. This rule does offer the President a final chance, and it is fair. It is a place holder, in case he has a change of heart in this crucial issue and decides he was to be relevant to the debate after all.

In addition, this rule allows three other proposals to be offered under the standing procedure of the House, including a proposal I am proud to co-sponsor offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that charts a path to a balanced budget within 5 years instead of 7.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that doing nothing really is disaster. We have a moral responsibility in our country to bring this budget into balance. The mess we are in certainly did not come about overnight. It took decades to accumulate nearly \$5 trillion in debt. By the way, that is still growing today, as we speak, under the Clinton budget. Cleaning up the mess will not be easy, but it must be done, and the first step lies, obviously, in balancing the annual budget.

I am proud of the extraordinary effort of the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, and his Committee on the Budget. They have demonstrated that we can indeed have a balanced budget by 2002. They have attacked waste and fraud; they have attacked abuse, reviewing every program in the Federal budget to set priorities.

I am gratified that they have included many of my discretionary spending suggestions totaling more than \$30 billion it seems in savings over 5 years as we proceed through the processes. I would note to Members that they can review the rest of my list of 75 proposed cuts that save \$275 billion over 5 years if there are specific discretionary cuts suggested in the Kasich budget they strongly oppose and they would like to replace them in months ahead.

Equally important, the Committee on the Budget has acted to save Medicare, a program headed for collapse, unless we do something. Again, doing nothing is disaster for Medicare. This is a program that is in fact going broke, part A.

Let it be clear to you: Under the budget blueprint before us today, per capita Medicare spending is set to increase by more than 33 percent in the next 7 years. Only in the minds of status quo Washington liberals would that be translated into a cut. I know the increase in Medicare is good for seniors. I am one. I am also a grandfather, as I said, and I think I have responsibility to both seniors and to my children and grandchildren.

Sure, it is going to get hot in this kitchen. But to my friends on the other side of the aisle who seem more interested in hot and hateful rhetoric about the rich and in the cool comfort of the status quo, I say if you cannot stand the heat, then find a door and exit the kitchen, and let those of us willing to take the risk, to meet the challenge, to get on with the recipe for saving the American dream for our children and grandchildren.

Vote for this rule, please, and for the Kasich balanced budget as well.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for allowing me this time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, why are Republicans cutting Medicare to pay a tax break for

the very, very rich? I cannot for the life of me figure it out why my Republican colleagues would want to give a big fat tax break to the very rich, so badly, that they would slash Medicare to the point that by the year 2002 every senior citizen will have to pay an additional \$1,000 a year out of his pocket. But I did not sign that contract on America, Mr. Speaker, so there are things that I really do not understand about it.

But I am glad I did not, because this budget inspired by the contract will cut money from student loans, medical research, and LIHEAP. And, because of this budget, Boston teaching hospitals alone stand to lose over \$700 million during the next 7 years, 20,000 Boston families will not have heat in the winter, and the cost of a college education will go up \$5,000 per student.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends say that this budget represents tough choices. It does. But I ask, tough on whom? It certainly is not tough on anyone in this Chamber, and it is certainly not tough on anyone earning over \$200,000 per year. But let me tell you who it is tough on. It is tough on those struggling families who will not be able to send their kids to college. It is tough on those American senior citizens who may have to go without heat in the winter and who will definitely be paying higher medical bills. And it is tough on the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the interests of seniors, in the interest of students, to oppose this Republican budget, and give up the idea of a tax break for the very, very rich. Let us come up with a real budget bill, Mr. Speaker, that does not harm the people who need help, and not help the people who do not need it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, GA [Mr. LINDER], another very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, who has been a real asset to this body since he came here.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for House Resolution 142, the rule which allows for the consideration of several balanced budget proposals. Only 7 months ago it would have been impossible to imagine debating a bill to actually balance the budget by the year 2002.

Under the rule the House will have a historic opportunity tomorrow to fully debate and consider four balanced budget resolutions. In fact, the rule allows for a fifth balanced budget proposal, one from the President of the United States. While I am pleased the rule provides him with that opportunity, it appears that the President has decided to forfeit any leadership on the issue of America's financial stability.

In February I watched as President Clinton and House and Senate Democrats refused to support the balanced budget amendment. I now realize that

they are incapable of curbing their irresponsible spending habits, so they have decided to play politics with our Nation's future.

Americans understand the fiscal trouble the Nation is in and the tough measures required to fix the mess. We must do something about the deficit and the debt now. We are out of tomorrows. The debt and deficit costs all of us money in the form of higher taxes, higher interest rates, and a slower economy. Moreover, it is immoral for this generation to leave our children the bill for our excesses.

Our current financial crisis is as much a threat to our Nation's children and grandchildren as Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan were to children half a century ago. House Republicans have pledged to balance the budget in 7 years. The generation of World War II saved the world in less time, but we need a united front on this too.

The change in the size of the Federal Government we propose will affect all Americans in some way. If we are incapable of sticking together to get control of our fiscal affairs, America will collapse from within. America is capable of solving problems. I believe we will rally together to do it again. I believe the American people are up to this challenge.

All around us Americans are discovering better ways to do everything. Yet the Federal Government remains the least-changed institution in America society and the President and his party seem satisfied with that. In times of crisis, Americans pull together. We can no longer skirt the issue, although administration officials Tyson and Pannetta have tried to.

As in World War II, we need the talents and skills of every individual. This notion is not too romantic for us to conceive that with the help of the American people, we will balance the budget, provide a safe and prosperous future for our children, and save our country.

The rule under discussion gives House Members the opportunity to vote on legislation to require the Federal Government to live under the same budget constraints that every American family lives under. We are running out of chances. We are running out of choices. I urge my colleagues to support the rule that will allow this historic debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and to the budget resolution, as reported by the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the rule, and to the budget resolution, as reported by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposing this rule because of our objections to the way the majority

has treated the minority in developing this rule. There was no valid reason for the majority members of the Rules Committee to deny the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] the opportunity to present to the House, under their own names, a budget plan that they themselves authored.

The Stenholm-Orton plan, which under this rule would be offered by the minority leader, is a far more sensible and equitable alternative than the Budget Committee's plan. It offers a way of reaching the same goal as the Budget Committee's plan—a balanced budget in 7 years—through spending cuts that are much more modest and reasonable.

Among other things, the Stenholm-Orton alternative would cut Medicare by over \$100 billion less over 7 years than the Budget Committee plan. In fact, it would cut all entitlement programs—programs that provide much-needed income for millions of Americans—by over \$200 billion less than the Budget Committee's plan. And, it would provide \$35 billion more for education and training, \$11 billion more for health, and \$60 billion less for defense than the Budget Committee's plan.

The Stenholm-Orton plan achieves the goal of a balanced budget in 7 years through less extreme cuts primarily by excluding the ill-advised, \$350 billion tax cut that the Budget Committee plan includes—a tax cut which mostly benefits the very wealthiest Americans, and which is paid for by cutting benefits for the most vulnerable Americans—the poor, the elderly, and children.

As the Stenholm-Orton plan, and the other two plans that will be offered under this rule—the Payne-Owens substitute and the Neumann-Solomon substitute—demonstrate, there are different ways to reach a balanced budget over a 7-year time period. That is why few of us objected to the ground rules for this debate—that all substitutes offered as alternatives to the Budget Committee's plan would also need to achieve a balanced budget by 2002.

The question we have to ask in considering each alternative is: Does this plan provide a fair and equitable way to balance the budget?

The answer, in the case of the Budget Committee's plan, quite clearly, is no.

With its \$350 billion tax cut, that benefits the wealthy, and its preservation of corporate tax breaks—and its extreme cuts in Medicare and in dozens of other programs which benefit average Americans, the Budget Committee's plan provides for a huge transfer of resources from the poor, from children, from the elderly, to the rich. It is a plan that hurts those who need the most help from Government, and helps those who needs it the least. In terms of social policy, it makes no sense whatsoever.

What is more, the claim that this budget favors children is debatable. It is true, of course, that it would be a good thing for our children to inherit less debt from us. But what kind of country are we leaving for them if we cut education and job training and highways and mass transit and environmental protection programs and energy research and development and health research and public broadcasting? What kind of opportunities will they have if college loans become unaffordable and vocational training unavailable?

Many people speak of the Federal Government these days as though it is completely disconnected from the American people when,

in fact, our Government is a very important part of almost every American's life. Nearly everyone has a family member who is receiving Social Security and Medicare. Millions of middle-class American families depend on the Student Loan Program to educate their children. Millions of moderate-income working Americans depend on the earned income tax credit to make ends meet. Millions of Americans depend on support from the Federal Government through all kinds of programs.

We should be spending less on some of these programs, but it is wrong to cut them so that we can reduce taxes for wealthy Americans—those who have already reaped the greatest economic rewards in recent years. There should be shared sacrifice in our goal to reach a balanced budget; instead, if the Budget Committee's plan is adopted, there will be definite winners and losers. And, unfortunately, those who already have the most will be the winners; those with the least will be the losers.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Committee's plan is flawed not only because it is unfair, but also because it also raises serious doubts about whether its promised reductions in deficits are achievable.

For one thing, by splitting the reconciliation process into two separate measures—one for Medicare cuts, which are to be reported by the Ways and Means and Commerce Committees by mid-September, and all other cuts, which are to be reported by the appropriate committees by mid-July—the Budget Committee plan increases the likelihood that the \$282 billion in Medicare cuts required by the plan will not be achieved. The Republican leadership is likely to find that it is far more difficult to enact these extremely deep cuts in Medicare if they are not part of a larger deficit-reduction plan that applies to more than one group of Americans.

In addition, the Budget Committee plan relies on extremely optimistic economic assumptions to achieve a balanced budget by 2002. This is particularly true with respect to the plan's projected interest rates, which many nonpartisan economists have said are unrealistically low. The level of interest rates, of course, has a tremendous bearing on the amount the Federal Government will need to spend on interest payments on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, again, we do not object to considering a plan to balance the budget over the next 7 years. In fact, many of us—particularly those of us who have spent many years struggling with the deficit problem—are very pleased that the debate, as many Members have pointed out recently, has moved from whether we should balance the budget over the 7 years, to how we should do it. The Republican leadership, and in particular, the chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], deserves a great deal of credit for that change.

However, as I said earlier, we do object to the way in which the rule treats the Stenholm-Orton plan, and I urge a no vote on the rule for that reason. I also urge our colleagues to vote no on the Budget Committee's budget plan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this debate comes down to one very simple question: Do you think we should cut

Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security in order to pay for tax cuts for the privileged few?

In the next 2 days, we are going to see a lot of charts and numbers on this floor.

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

People like Margaret Leslie—who I have a picture of here today.

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

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

When she was young, she answered the call of this country—and helped build the B-20's that helped the Allies win World War II.

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

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

And she struggles to make ends meet.

But instead of trying to make Margaret's life easier today this Republican budget is going to make her life harder.

The budget before us today will take \$240 out of Margaret's Social Security check.

And over the next 7 years, it will force her to pay an additional \$3,500 for Medicare.

Not to balance the budget. Not to cut the deficit.

The Republicans are cutting Medicare for one reason and one reason only: To pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest people and the wealthiest corporations in our country.

The Wall Street Journal calls this plan the biggest tax-saving bonanza in years for upper income Americans. And if you're a wealthy corporation you might not have to pay any taxes at all.

The last time Republicans were in power, 130 of the top 250 corporations paid no taxes at all for at least 1 year. We changed that law, but this budget changes it right back.

Now did the Republicans target the \$200 billion we dole out in corporate tax breaks each year? No.

Did the Republicans target billionaires who get \$3.6 billion in tax breaks for renouncing their American citizenship? No.

Instead, they targeted senior citizens and working families. And don't just take my word for it.

Last week, the New York Times revealed the contents of a secret Republican memo.

Under the Republican plan Medicare deductibles will double, premiums will go up by 50 percent, copayments will increase, care will be rationed, and the choice of doctors will be limited.

Mr. Speaker, this won't just affect seniors.

How is the average working family going to pay for the cost of caring for their parents and their grandparents?

And don't come to this floor today and tell us you're trying to save the Medicare system. As Margaret Leslie says, “Republicans haven't cared about Medicare for 30 years. We're not about to believe you now.”

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not just about numbers. It's about basic dignity.

People like Margaret Leslie stood by this country in time of war and peace. And we must stand by them today. That is the sacred promise we made on Medicare—and it's time we live up to that promise.

But this budget is a broken promise.

And at the end of the day, senior citizens and working families throughout this country will be asking one question: why are Republicans cutting Medicare and cutting Social Security in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people and the wealthiest corporations in this country?

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

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I read in the same paper, though, that Speaker GINGRICH promises that while these cuts are big, they will be painless. Will they be painless for Margaret Leslie?

Mr. BONIOR. Reclaiming my time, they clearly are not painless. People like Margaret Leslie who stood by the country in the time of war and peace deserve a much better break than what Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans are offering in the way of higher deductibles and premiums in this particular bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, one of the most gentlemanly, courteous, gracious, and most well-liked Members of this body. He has always figures, however, how we could come up with closed rules which appear to be open rules.

Now, with all affection and all respect for my good friend, I had a little amendment which I appeared before the Committee on Rules with. I received the same gracious attention I always do up there, and I want the gentleman to know how grateful I am for both his friendship and the kind way he treated me.

□ 1300

He did not treat me kindly enough because he did not allow the offering of the amendment. And the amendment offers a really good choice, something which the gentleman from New York and the Committee on Rules have denied this House again.

So I am compelled now to call my dear friend “closed rule Solomon” be-

cause he presents us these wonderful rules which in fact do not permit the House to have a fair exposition of the business before it or to engage in a proper discussion of all the important questions.

The amendment that I would have offered was specifically designed to address the problems associated with the policy direction that many in the House are moving with respect to block grants. It would have allowed the return of Medicaid and four welfare block grants to the States over a 5-year phaseout period. Better than \$539 billion in savings would have been generated. I would have taken as a base text the language of my Republican colleagues' bill. It would have restored \$282 billion. It would have permitted \$18 billion to be returned to graduated student loans, and it would have allowed \$50 billion to go to the middle-income people in forms of a tax cut which would have redistributed the moneys in a way which would not only have been fairer but could have contributed more greatly and speedily to the well-being of this country and to the assistance of the middle class.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just want to tell the gentleman that there are two Democrat alternatives, two Republicans. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was given the choice between you and the other one. He could have made that choice. If the gentleman would see Mr. GEPHARDT, I think that would solve his problem.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, that is a very artful point that the gentleman makes. I want to commend his for it. As a dialectician, he has few peers. However, the hard fact of the matter is that to say we are going to give us two choices and give you two choices does not allow a real debate. All giving two choices is is it limits the choices before the House to four questions.

It does not allow us to specifically address whether or not we are, for example, cutting Medicare, which, in fact, we are. Nor does it allow us to properly address the cuts in Medicaid or student loans or school lunches or title I education funding or veterans' medical care or low-income heating assistance, all of which proposals are being savaged by the Republican budget. It does not give us time to debate them. It does not give the House an opportunity to consider amendments dealing with these different points.

I love the gentleman from New York. He is one of the finest men around here. I enjoy my little skirmishes with him up in the Committee on Rules more than I can say, but the hard fact of the matter is, even with his charm and skill, the distinguished gentleman from New York cannot deny that, in fact, this is a gag rule which is going to foreclose the House from proper consideration of some of the most important

questions, not only for this year but for the 7 years which follow.

I again express my respect for my good friend, "closed rule SOLOMON."

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, why are the Republicans cutting Medicare to pay for a tax break for the rich? And two of the people who want to know more about this are in the Kierklewski family in Austin, TX. Louis is 94 years young; his son Ed is 62. They are among millions of American citizens who will suffer from the broken promises contained in this budget resolution. Louis and Ed were among 200 senior citizens and people that were concerned with them in Austin, TX, last Saturday who came together to express their great concern about the broken promises that are composed in this Republican budget.

Louis Kierklewski has devoted his life to hard work. He repaired looms in a textile factory until that job gave out. Then he went to work at the church as a janitor. And now all he has for economic sustenance is a \$549 Social Security check and his Medicare. And he already has to spend out of that \$195 just for prescriptions because Medicare, as important as it is, does not cover prescriptions.

And Ed—Ed worked 20 years defending this country in the U.S. Air Force. Now he is working as a custodian, moving towards retirement. And he and his wife are worried, and they have good reason to worry about this Republican budget.

The Republicans propose to double, and they did not bother telling us about this in the Committee on the Budget but we found out later through their secret memos, to double the deductible that Louis so going to have to pay and that in a couple years Ed is going to have to pay and then keep raising the deductible after they have doubled it year after year after year.

Now, if in fact Louis needs to go to the lab, he is going to have to pay extra money under the Republican plan. And if Ed decides that he needs home health care, he will have to pay extra money for that.

If Ed or Louis had the audacity to say, we want the same doctor we have always had, well, the Republicans are going to charge them \$20 each per month to claim their own doctor. And meanwhile, their premiums will go up month after month, year after year under this Republican plan. That is why the AARP, the retired persons group, calls this Republican plan a sick tax on the most frail and vulnerable seniors in our society.

I guess the problem is that the Republicans had old Captain Crunch over there with the number crunchers at the Committee on the Budget, crunching away at the budget, but what they forgot about is that when you crunch numbers in a budget, sometimes you crunch human beings like Louis and Ed

Kierklewski, the kind of people who built this into the greatest Nation in the world.

When the Republicans crunch the numbers this time they are really crushing every American who is dependent on Medicare or hopes to be in the future.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule, although I do so somewhat reluctantly.

When I joined with 23 of my conservative Democratic colleagues to form the coalition, I did so in an effort to help lift the debate on important issues before the House above petty partisan politics. So far this Congress, members of the coalition have succeeded in avoiding petty partisan maneuvering.

Congressmen ORTON, STENHOLM, BROWDER, PETERSON, and myself authored a budget proposal that we feel a majority of Americans will support. We feel it approaches a balanced budget in a more common sense, less painful approach than does the Kasich proposal.

However, when we went to the Rules Committee to ask that our proposal be allowed time on the floor, we were met by opposition. The Republican controlled committee, under pressure from their leadership, did not want to allow our proposal floor time. I do not know why—maybe they are worried that our proposal is the one that a majority of Congress, including Republicans, would support.

The Democratic leadership has risen above the partisan maneuvering and has allowed the coalition to offer our plan in the slot normally reserved for the minority leadership's proposal. As it turns out, this gesture by the Democratic leadership, was the only chance for our plan to be heard on the floor.

I am glad my party's leadership has chosen to rise above the petty partisan politics of today. I only hope that in the future, the Republican leadership will also choose to abandon the old ways of partisan maneuvering and provide equal opportunity for all voices to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, because of Leader GEPHARDT's offer of floor time, I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE]. She is one of the new members of the Committee on Rules and an outstanding Member of this body.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this rule. By adopting this rule, we will debate and then pass a plan to balance the Federal budget within 7 years. That statement could not have been made in this Chamber a year ago. But things have changed, and after the November elections there should be no question about the will of the American people.

They expect us to be courageous enough to make the difficult choices that some naysayers in this body have been avoiding for decades now.

But thinking in terms of the future is not always easy. There is comfort in the status quo and there are those who will use almost any tactic to preserve it. We have already seen this morning the Committee on the Budget's good work portrayed as attacks on seniors and children. We have heard actual increases in spending being called cuts. But despite these scare tactics and blatant misuse of the English language, I am confident that our seniors will appreciate the steps we are taking to preserve and protect and improve Medicare, a program which would be bankrupt in 7 short years if we do not act.

The plan crafted by the Committee on the Budget offers solutions no more complicated or profound than those employed every day by hard working, responsible families who play by the rules, pay the bills and make ends meet.

This is a fair and balanced rule. It calls for honest debate on four very different proposals to bring the budget into balance. Two Democratic ones and two Republican ones, and we are still holding things open for the President's plan. I hope we see it.

But I encourage every Member to watch this debate closely. Substitutes will be considered under the regular order of the House. Nothing fancy, nothing tricky. This rule was not designed to give political cover. Every vote counts.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this historic day, I urge my colleagues to adopt this reasonable rule and get on with the task ahead. Anything less would deprive America's children of their potential, the kind of safe and prosperous future they deserve.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, why are Republicans cutting Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few?

That's what my constituents Julius and Dottie Ruskin of West Haven, CT, who are pictured here, want to know.

The Republicans have promised tax giveaways to the most well-off in our society, and now they have to pay for those promises by taking away from the most vulnerable among us—senior citizens on Medicare like Julius and Dottie.

The Republicans claim that their budget plan demands fair shared sacrifice to balance the budget. But where's the sacrifice from people making more than \$350,000, they get a \$20,000 tax break under the Republican plan. Where's the sacrifice from all the beneficiaries of corporate welfare, the Republican chairman of the Ways and Means Committee refuses to close their special interest loopholes. The primary sacrifice demanded by the Republicans is from seniors like Julius and Dottie Ruskin who depend on Medicare.



This sacrifice isn't fair, and it isn't shared.

The Republican plan would cut Medicare by \$288 billion. The average senior in Connecticut would pay \$1,167 more a year in out-of-pocket expenses by the year 2002. The Republican plan means that the Ruskins will pay more every time they go to the doctor.

This plan will increase the annual deductible seniors must pay for doctor's services from \$100 to \$150. It will nearly double the monthly premium from \$46 to \$84 by the year 2002, an increase of \$456 a year for seniors. It will add a 20-percent sick tax for home health care and laboratory tests.

Let me tell you about the Ruskins. Julius and Dottie live on Social Security and his Armstrong/Pirelli Tire Co. pension for a total annual income of about \$14,000 per year. Just last month his doctor visits and medication costs totaled \$10,000.

But their biggest concern is that the Republican plan may force them into an HMO and limit their choice of doctors. Julius sees six doctors, most of them specialists, and Dottie sees three doctors, and it is important to them to maintain these special relationships. The Republican plan threatens this trusted care that they now receive.

The Republicans may be keeping their promises to the privileged few. But they're breaking our Nation's historic promise to seniors like Julius and Dottie Ruskin.

□ 1315

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

Ms. DELAURO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the former Republican Secretary of HEW has warned the Republicans not to go down in history as the party that destroyed Medicare. I wonder whether these cuts will destroy Medicare for this family.

Ms. DELAURO. For Dottie and Julius, their lives would be destroyed by the cuts that are in the Republican plan to cut Medicare. Make no bones about it, these are cuts and the Republicans need to face up to that.

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

Mr. Speaker, while the photograph is still up there, I think the gentlewoman has our plan mixed up with the President's health care plan last year. That would have forced couples into HMO's; nor our plan. Second, that same couple now receive \$400 in Medicare benefits. Under our plan it will go to \$12,600. That is quite a difference. That couple is going to be lucky if our plan passes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished and outstanding gentlewoman from Salt Lake City, UT [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], a new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, today we begin the most critical debate this Congress will undertake. This debate is critical, it is about how to bal-

ance the Federal budget, not whether we are going to do it, and how to stop piling up debt for services and programs that we use now but that our children are going to have to pay for.

Mr. Speaker, I said how we balance the budget, not whether we balance the budget, because we have already had the easy part of this debate. Earlier this year, 300 Members of this House voted in favor of a balanced budget amendment, and we only need 218 votes to actually pass a balanced budget. It is easy to say we should balance the budget in the abstract. It takes courage and commitment, Mr. Speaker, to set priorities and make the difficult decisions that will actually balance this budget and preserve our Nation's future. In the next 48 hours, the American people will see who is willing to balance this budget and who is willing just to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, let me say I am very proud of the committee's decision to only allow out onto this floor budgets that balance in 7 years. This requirement was clearly communicated, not only to every Member of the House, but also to the President. I think it is very regrettable that the President chose not to participate in this critical turning point for our Nation, and did not provide us with a balanced budget that reflects his priorities and ideas as to how to end the financial calamity we face as a Nation.

However, this debate is not just about our children, as critical and important as that is. My parents are 75 years old. They just celebrated their golden wedding anniversary. Now, after a lifetime of work and sacrifice for their family and for their country, the Medicare trustees tell them that in 7 years there will be no money for their hospital care, no money for their home health care when they will need it the most.

This Republican budget plan will preserve and protect Medicare, not stand by and criticize and hope that no one holds us accountable when senior citizens lose their health care in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud of the fact that this rule does not use the old king-of-the-hill process used in prior Congresses that allowed Members to vote for amendments they knew would never become law, but that provided them political cover at home.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for a fair, honest debate on how we balance the budget. It is time to do it for our children, it is time to do it for our parents. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and end decade of lack of responsibility and balance the budget.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this morning if Members watched "Good Morning America" or other news shows, they talked about

American heroes in Oklahoma City, and our heart goes out to these wonderful men and women who sacrificed so much, and at many times put their own lives in peril, to help others.

I want to introduce Members to another American hero, a person who is listening to this debate today very carefully, a person who wants to know what this House of Representatives feels about Medicare and Medicaid.

The person I want to introduce Members to is Mr. Solon Blundell of Huntsville, AL. Here is an American hero. Mr. Blundell, 72 years old, spent 20 years caring for his mother-in-law who had suffered a series of strokes and was paralyzed. When he wanted to retire from his job as an engineer, he was forced to work an additional 4 years so he could have adequate funds and medical coverage to take care of his mother-in-law.

If fate had not dealt him that tough card alone, it turns out that his daughter Becky, suffering from Lou Gehrig's disease and now on a respirator, must depend on Medicaid to make sure that her medical bills are paid for. Mr. Blundell, in Huntsville, AL, and his wife are real heroes and heroines, working across America as so many seniors do to try to get by, to try to care for others.

Therefore, we have to ask ourselves this fundamental question. If these people need this basic program of Medicare to provide help for themselves and for others, why are the Republicans coming today to cut Medicare under the Republican budget resolution?

They will tell us they are going to spend more money in a few years on Medicare. That is true. What they do not tell us is that the actual cost of Medicare is going to go up even higher than the money they are providing. What they do not tell us is that more seniors will qualify for Medicare, and they will not have the funds to provide it.

What does it mean to Mr. Blundell and so many other families across America? It means more money out of pocket, it means more premiums, it means more coinsurance payments, it means the loss of some Medicare services. It leads to possible rationing. It could lead to eliminating his family's choice of the doctor that they want.

Is that the vision of America that we want to see? In this debate on a balanced budget, let us focus on why we are making these cuts. The reasons the Republicans are cutting Medicare almost \$300 billion is because they need almost \$300 billion to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Their plan that they put forward in this Chamber, which carried in large part by Republican votes, gave tax breaks to wealthy individuals making over \$100,000 a year, and the most profitable corporations in America. To plug that hole in the Treasury, where do they turn? The program Mr. Blundell turns to every day to make sure that his mother-in-law and now his daughter have adequate medical care.



Mr. Speaker, I hope we will think twice. This debate is not about statistics, it is not about a toteboard running in the background, it is about real people and real American heroes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will take just a moment to correct the last speaker that suggested that benefits for Medicare would go down. Actually, under these proposals, individual, per person benefits increase from \$4,700 per person to \$6,300 per person, so I would like to clear that up.

I just want to compliment the Committee on Rules on turning out a rule that is going to go down in the history books, if we are successful, in getting on the glide path toward a balanced budget.

I was particularly concerned with what we have been living with for the last 16 years, the so-called Gephardt rule that says "Let us sort of sneakily hide a vote to increase the debt ceiling within the rule IL, that says 'When you finally pass a budget resolution, you automatically pass a bill that increases the debt ceiling to accommodate the next fiscal year.'" I think this is a great rule. Let us vote for it. Let us move on toward a balanced budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Jonesville, WI [Mr. NEUMANN], one of the freshmen Members of this body who has brought a great deal of experience from the private sector, especially about knowing how to balance a budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to sit here and watch some of the pictures that were brought down here from the other side of the aisle today, because when we talk about balancing the budget, this is really about the future of a nation. It is not about numbers, it is not about a lot of the things we hear the rhetoric about, it is about the future of a nation. It is about the responsibility of this 104th Congress to do what is right for the future of our country, both the senior citizens, the people that are currently in the work force, and for our children. That is really what it is all about.

I commend the Committee on Rules for bringing forth a balanced budget proposal, the Neumann-Solomon proposal, that will actually balance the budget in 5 years, with the family tax cuts fully implemented. It also does something that we did not hear much about out here in this Congress when I came. That is it also contains a detailed plan on how to go about paying off that awful \$4.8 trillion debt. We do it over the next 30 years.

The third thing our plan does that is very significant is that it does not use the surplus funds collected in the Social Security system to reduce the defi-

cit, or in balancing the budget. It is very significant for our senior citizens to know that we do have a proposal out here on the floor of the House to be voted on tomorrow that literally sets aside the surplus funds for the Social Security system, so the Social Security system is solvent to the year 2030.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this plan is very, very versatile, and will also allow a lot of input from both sides of the aisle, as well as the American people, in that it does not spell out specifically the reductions that are needed, but rather, lists the reductions that are needed to get to a balanced budget, and \$70 billion in addition, so we can debate them over the course of the summer.

I urge my colleagues to do what is right for the future of our country: support the rule, support the Neumann-Solomon amendment tomorrow.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Morris, IL [Mr. WELLER], another distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of living within our means. For over a generation, the tax-and-spend liberals who ran this Congress for over 40 years have stiffed our kids and our families with a massive national debt now totaling \$4.8 trillion. That is \$18,000 for every man, woman, and child in this room and throughout our country.

The tax-and-spend liberals in the Democratic Party have behaved like a drunk out on the town with someone else's credit card. The children are the ones who will suffer, because liberals always leave someone else to pay the tab.

This budget is our contract with our Nation's children. We will balance this budget to ensure that our children have a future free of debt and full of economic opportunity. We will balance the budget by cutting spending first. We will eliminate bureaucracy, wasteful spending, and programs that simply are not working. We will return power to families, communities, and States.

We are providing tax relief for families. It is time for leadership. It is time to live within our means. It is time to protect Medicare and protect Social Security. Republicans are keeping our promise. I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to a very distinguished Member, the gentleman from Ocala, FL [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for this rule. I want to say one thing. Every term I have been here in Congress I have been trying to repeal the Gephardt rule which was put in in 1976, that says we can go ahead and increase the debt around here without a vote.

I see in this rule, the gentleman has taken the courageous step to go forward and say "no, sir, we are going to have to vote on increasing the debt." I

commend the gentleman for that. I think all the Members in Congress should recognize that we have changed history in this matter. I would like to see the same action in the following years, as well as Congress in the future.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, we have accomplished that because of him.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in order to close, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Republicans and Democrats alike to defeat this rule, and give this Congress an honest and open debate about this Republican budget and its consequences for hardworking American families.

The fact is the Republicans want to force this budget through the Congress without adequate debate. This budget was produced in the Committee on the Budget, and a vote was had on it the same day, an unprecedented rush to bring it through the committee before anyone could even know what was in it. If this rule passes, we cannot even consider all of the Democratic alternatives to the Republican budget.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has an alternative that he wanted to bring. It is not in order. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] wanted to bring a budget. They were not allowed to do it. They were told they had to do it through me.

This is one of the most important changes in the budget we have ever had, and we are in such a rush to get it done before, I guess, anyone can find out really what is in it, that we are not having an open, small d, democratic process, which this country deserves.

The people deserve to know what is in this budget. We need to consider every alternative, because if the American people are given a moment to consider it, they will find the Republican budget is so much more reckless, so much more extreme than any budget that has come before, it really belongs in Guinness' Book of World Records.

□ 1330

The largest Medicare cuts in history, slashing seniors' benefits by more than \$1,000 a year. And we can talk all day about what is a cut. I will tell you what is a cut. A cut is what a senior citizen has to face. They are going to face higher copays and higher deductibles and higher premiums to buy the health insurance they have under Medicare today.

Further than that, a back-door cut in Social Security, in the pension. Republicans took the oath. They made a hollow campaign promise to protect America's retirement program. What did they do? The promise is broken in this budget. There will be an annual cut in the cost of living escalator in Social Security.

We heard it was off the table. It is on the table. So I guess we are in a rush to get it done before anybody can find out what happened.

Social Security should not be on this budget. It was never expected to be in this budget. It is in this budget. People deserve to know about it before their Representatives have to vote on it.

Unprecedented cuts in student loans. The most important investment we will ever make in the future of this country is student loans. But yet we are going to have a cut that will shut millions of young people out of their ability to get an education.

Mr. Speaker, these programs are not waste, fraud and abuse. They are the backbone of the American dream. They are counted on by millions of working families.

To make it worse, what is all this for? It is for a tax cut that lavishes the most on those who have the most. The million richest Americans walk away with a \$20,000 average tax cut, while we are taking \$1,000 out of the pockets of senior citizens, or we are adding \$5,000 to the cost of a student loan.

These are not American values. This is a redistribution from the middle class of this country, and the people who are struggling to get into the middle class, to the people who have it made.

We all want to get rich. Everybody should be able to live the American dream, but this is not the way to do it. I urge Members to vote against this rule.

Let's have every alternative on the table. Let's have a longer debate than 6 hours over a budget that is going to decimate the middle class of this country to help the richest people in the country. It is wrong, and we need a full debate so the American people can see the wrongness of this decision.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we would be glad to make those amendments in order. If the President would give us his balanced budget, if the previous speaker would give us his balanced budget, we will put it on this floor. They have none. That is why it is not available.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the sky is falling, the sky is falling. That is what

we have been getting from the other side of the aisle. Only in Washington, DC., can an increase of from \$4,700 to \$6,300 for Medicare recipients over a 7-year period be labeled a Draconian cut. Nowhere else in the world would it possibly be considered that except on the floor of this Congress.

This is a very fair and balanced rule.

Last year they gave us 4 hours for general debate. This year we are providing 6 hours of general debate, a 50 percent increase over the allotted time from last year.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many of our colleagues come to the aisle over the past few minutes with pictures of individuals who they claim will be victimized by this budget. Yet virtually every single one of them who stood in the well on January 26 of this year voted in favor of one of the balanced budget amendments that would have, by the year 2002, brought us to a balanced budget. They talk about it and yet they will not recognize that we have to make some modifications without hurting those individuals if we are in fact going to get to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important vote. This is a very important time for us as a Congress to step up to the plate and do the responsible thing. We are not going to be hurting those students. We are not going to be hurting senior citizens. It is nothing but rhetoric. We have to look at the facts. As we proceed with the next 6 hours of general debate, we will be doing just that.

We are waiting for the Democrats' budget plan. A copy of it, in fact, is being held by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. It is empty. They are not stepping up to the plate. We are. We are simply encouraging them to join us so in a bipartisan way we should vote for the previous question, for this very fair and balanced rule, and move ahead toward our glide path of a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous resolution on the question.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 170, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—252

Allard	Bachus	Baker (LA)
Archer	Baessler	Ballenger
Armey	Baker (CA)	Barr

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

NAYS—170

Abercrombie	Bryant (TX)	Deutsches
Ackerman	Cardin	Dicks
Andrews	Clay	Dingell
Baldacci	Clayton	Dixon
Barcia	Clement	Doggett
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Doyle
Becerra	Coleman	Durbin
Beilenson	Collins (MI)	Edwards
Bentsen	Conyers	Engel
Bishop	Costello	Eshoo
Bonior	Coyne	Evans
Borski	Danner	Farr
Boucher	de la Garza	Fazio
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Fields (LA)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Filner
Brown (OH)	Dellums	Foglietta

Ford	Manton	Rivers
Frank (MA)	Markey	Roemer
Frost	Martinez	Rose
Furse	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Matsui	Rush
Gephardt	McCarthy	Sabo
Gibbons	McDermott	Sanders
Gonzalez	McHale	Sawyer
Gordon	McKinney	Schroeder
Green	McNulty	Scott
Gutierrez	Meehan	Serrano
Hall (OH)	Meek	Skaggs
Hamilton	Menendez	Skelton
Harman	Mfume	Slaughter
Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hefner	Mineta	Stokes
Hilliard	Minge	Studds
Hinchey	Mink	Stupak
Holden	Moakley	Tanner
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Tejeda
Jacobs	Moran	Thompson
Jefferson	Murtha	Thurman
Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Torres
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Torricelli
Johnston	Oberstar	Towns
Kanjorski	Obey	Tucker
Kaptur	Oliver	Velazquez
Kennedy (MA)	Ortiz	Vento
Kennedy (RI)	Orton	Visclosky
Kennelly	Owens	Volkmer
Kildee	Pallone	Ward
Klink	Pastor	Waters
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Lantos	Pelosi	Waxman
Levin	Pomeroy	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Poshard	Wise
Lipinski	Rahall	Woolsey
Lofgren	Rangel	Wyden
Lowey	Reed	Wynn
Luther	Reynolds	Yates
Maloney	Richardson	

## NOT VOTING—12

Berman	Fattah	Klecza
Bono	Flake	Schumer
Chapman	Hayes	Vucanovich
Collins (IL)	Hoyer	Wilson

□ 1356

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bono for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 168, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—255

Allard	Bilirakis	Calvert
Archer	Bliley	Camp
Armey	Blute	Canady
Bachus	Boehlert	Castle
Baesler	Boehner	Chabot
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baker (LA)	Brewster	Chenoweth
Ballenger	Browder	Christensen
Barr	Brownback	Chrysler
Barrett (NE)	Bryant (TN)	Clinger
Bartlett	Bunn	Coble
Barton	Bunning	Coburn
Bass	Burr	Collins (GA)
Bateman	Burton	Combest
Bereuter	Buyer	Condit
Bilbray	Callahan	Cooley

Cox	Hutchinson	Quinn
Cramer	Hyde	Radanovich
Crane	Inglis	Ramstad
Crapo	Istook	Regula
Creameans	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Cunningham	Jones	Roemer
Davis	Kasich	Rogers
Deal	Kelly	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Kim	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	King	Rose
Dickey	Kingston	Roth
Dooley	Klug	Roukema
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Royce
Dornan	Kolbe	Salmon
Dreier	LaHood	Sanford
Duncan	Largent	Saxton
Dunn	Latham	Scarborough
Ehlers	LaTourette	Schaefer
Ehrlich	Laughlin	Schiff
Emerson	Lazio	Seastrand
English	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Ensign	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
Ewing	Lightfoot	Shays
Fawell	Lincoln	Shuster
Fields (TX)	Linder	Sisisky
Flanagan	Livingston	Skeen
Foley	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Forbes	Longley	Smith (NJ)
Fowler	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Fox	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Franks (CT)	Martini	Solomon
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Souder
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Spence
Frisa	McDade	Stearns
Funderburk	McHugh	Stenholm
Gallegly	McInnis	Stockman
Ganske	McIntosh	Stump
Gekas	McKeon	Talent
Geren	Metcalf	Tate
Gilchrest	Meyers	Tauzin
Gillmor	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Gilman	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Goodlatte	Minge	Thomas
Goodling	Molinari	Thornberry
Goss	Montgomery	Thornton
Graham	Moorhead	Thurman
Greenwood	Morella	Tiahrt
Gunderson	Myers	Torkildsen
Gutknecht	Myrick	Traficant
Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Upton
Hamilton	Neumann	Vucanovich
Hancock	Ney	Waldholtz
Hansen	Norwood	Walker
Hastert	Nussle	Walsh
Hastings (WA)	Orton	Wamp
Hayworth	Oxley	Watts (OK)
Hefley	Packard	Weldon (FL)
Heineman	Parker	Weldon (PA)
Herger	Paxon	Weller
Hilleary	Peterson (FL)	White
Hobson	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hoekstra	Petri	Wicker
Hoke	Pombo	Wilson
Horn	Porter	Wolf
Hostettler	Portman	Young (AK)
Houghton	Pryce	Young (FL)
Hunter	Quillen	Zimmer

## NOES—168

Ackerman	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Andrews	DeFazio	Gordon
Baldacci	DeLauro	Green
Barcia	Dellums	Gutierrez
Barrett (WI)	Deutscher	Hall (OH)
Becerra	Dicks	Harman
Beilenson	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Bentsen	Dixon	Hefner
Bevill	Doggett	Hilliard
Bishop	Doyle	Hinchey
Bonior	Durbin	Holden
Borski	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	Engel	Jacobs
Brown (CA)	Eshoo	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Johnson, E.B.
Bryant (TX)	Fattah	Johnston
Cardin	Fazio	Kanjorski
Clay	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Clayton	Filner	Kennedy (MA)
Clement	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Clyburn	Ford	Kennelly
Coleman	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Collins (MI)	Frost	Klink
Conyers	Furse	LaFalce
Costello	Gejdenson	Lantos
Coyne	Gephardt	Levin
Danner	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)

Lipinski	Oberstar	Skelton
Lofgren	Obey	Slaughter
Lowey	Oliver	Spratt
Luther	Ortiz	Stark
Maloney	Owens	Stokes
Manton	Pallone	Studds
Markey	Pastor	Stupak
Martinez	Payne (NJ)	Tanner
Mascara	Payne (VA)	Tejeda
Matsui	Pelosi	Thompson
McCarthy	Pickett	Torres
McDermott	Pomeroy	Torricelli
McHale	Poshard	Towns
McKinney	Rahall	Tucker
McNulty	Rangel	Velazquez
Meehan	Reed	Vento
Meek	Reynolds	Visclosky
Menendez	Richardson	Volkmer
Mfume	Rivers	Ward
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Mineta	Rush	Watt (NC)
Mink	Sabo	Waxman
Moakley	Sanders	Williams
Mollohan	Sawyer	Wise
Moran	Schroeder	Woolsey
Murtha	Scott	Wyden
Nadler	Serrano	Wynn
Neal	Skaggs	Yates

## NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Collins (IL)	Klecza
Berman	Flake	Schumer
Bono	Hayes	Zeliff
Chapman	Hoyer	

□ 1415

On this vote:

Mr. Beno for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT MAY 18, 1995, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 1561, THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations have until Thursday, May 18, 1995, to file a report on H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection if there are no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1561, THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the last unanimous-consent request, I would like to announce to Members that the Committee on Rules has tentatively scheduled to meet this coming Monday to consider a rule for H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act, more commonly known as the