

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 3322 and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House.

With warm personal regards, I am  
Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE,  
*Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, May 2, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Science,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 1, 1996, agreeing to delete portions of Title IV, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), of H.R. 3322, which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources.

I have memorialized our agreement in the form of an amendment to the bill. As you can see, it deletes authorization sections for the National Ocean Service (NOS) and the Ocean and Great Lakes Programs of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). It also removes provisions affecting the NOAA Corps, NOAA Fleet, the National Sea Grant College Program and the National Oceanographic Partnership Program. The amendment also eliminates from the program termination list contained in Subtitle D those programs funded under the programs and offices listed above.

In addition, the amendment removes a limitation contained in section 442, Limitations on Appropriations, which could foreclose the Resources Committee (or any other Committee) from authorizing funds for the many NOAA programs not authorized under H.R. 3322, like the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

Finally, the amendment makes technical conforming changes to the remaining text of Title IV.

If the Science Committee plans to make a manager's amendment for H.R. 3322 in order, I ask that these changes be contained in that amendment. If no such amendment is contemplated, I ask that you request the Rules Committee to make this amendment self-executing upon the adoption of the Rule for consideration of H.R. 3322. Of course, I assume that you would not offer or support any amendments adding back the provisions deleted per our agreement.

I also look forward to continuing our close working relationship on legislative matters our two Committees share during the remainder of this Congress.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,  
*Chairman.*

Amendments to H.R. 3322

Page 90, line 11, through page 93, line 13, strike subtitle B.

Page 93, line 14, redesignate subtitle C as subtitle B.

Page 94, line 4, through page 97, line 13, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 97, lines 14 and 21, redesignate subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively.

Page 98, line 1, redesignate subtitle D as subtitle C.

Page 98, lines 6 through 11, strike paragraphs (1) through (4).

Page 98, lines 16 through 21, strike paragraphs (8) through (12).

Page 99, lines 5 through 9, strike paragraphs (17) and (18).

Page 98, line 12, through page 99, line 10, redesignate paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (13), (14), (15), (16), and (19) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively.

Page 99, line 19, through page 100, line 7, strike subsections (c) and (d).

Page 100, lines 11 and 12, strike "and any other Act".

Page 100, line 20, through page 103, line 24, strike section 443.

Page 104, line 1, redesignate subtitle E as subtitle D.

Page 106, line 9, through page 116, line 9, strike section 453.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 3322, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNULTY. Last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, I was attending my daughter's graduation back home, and I missed rollcall No. 195 on the minimum wage bill, which I strongly support, and I want the RECORD to reflect my support for that bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

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 House and Senate on H. Con. Res 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, be instructed—

(1) to agree to the Senate-passed levels of discretionary spending, as set by the amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI;

(2) to agree to section 325 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to "balance billing" of Medicare patients by health care providers;

(3) to agree to section 326 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to Federal nursing home quality standards; and

(4) to agree to section 327 of the Senate-passed resolution, relating to protection

under the Medicaid program against spousal impoverishment.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in light of the fact that there are some flights at 9:30, that we limit debate on each side to 15 minutes. I have talked to the gentleman from Minnesota. It is okay with him. I would hope it would be okay with the gentleman from Ohio, too.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether this would then be a standing rule against the generally long-winded exhortations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], but if he wants to set a precedent here for brevity, I would be more than happy to accept this recommendation.

Still reserving the right to object, I have not heard the gentleman respond to that.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as brief as I can.

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

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

Mr. SABO. For the sake of my friend from Ohio, the gentleman from New York is not scheduled to speak.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, we will accept that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Members, the motion to instruct does four very important things: It asks the House to agree to the Senate discretionary levels as set by an amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI in the Senate and agreed to by a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate. This is to insure that we do not head to another Government shutdown in a long, dragged-out fight over appropriation bills. It is also about making sure that we adequately fund our programs for education, environmental and safety protection, research and development, and vital programs such as in agriculture.

We also instruct the House to agree to three Senate sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress resolutions. Budget resolutions are about numbers,

but it is ultimately also about policy. The Senate, through a sense of Congress, said that we should not be making changes in laws as they relate to spousal impoverishment and nursing home standards in Medicaid. I can think of no more fundamental policy that we should sustain in the Congress than those two basic priorities as we make modifications in Medicare, in Medicaid.

And we also say, and accept, a resolution from the Senate saying, that when we deal with changes in Medicare, we should not change the protections for seniors as it relates to balanced billing. In plain language, we should not let providers charge more than they are currently allowed to charge to seniors. Most of our seniors are very vulnerable, low-income people, and to change the Medicare system so that we ask higher payments from them, as proposed by the majority, is simply wrong.

So I urge the House to adopt this motion to instruct.

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

Let me first of all suggest that we cannot accept the motion to instruct for the simple reason that we really do not want to have our negotiating position dictated to us in a motion to instruct. In simple language, we do not intend to spend the \$5 billion in additional spending that the Senate has asked for.

□ 2030

But in all likelihood, we will agree to a somewhat higher level of spending in an effort to reach agreement with the Senate. We will probably spend a little bit more money than what we spent when we passed our House resolution.

Second, however, we do not take, really, exception to the idea of having Federal nursing home quality standards. We, in fact, adopted that language in our proposal when we were in the Committee on the Budget, to make sure that we had the kind of protection for our seniors that we want as it relates to nursing home quality. We also have a change in the way in which we do the qualifications for Medicaid.

Let me just say that there are large pieces of this motion to instruct that we not only agree with, but we have solved in our resolution; but the idea that we ought to just spend this \$5 billion extra is something we are not prepared to commit to because while we want to emphasize the programs for the environment, in which we have full funding of Superfund, and while we want to emphasize the programs of education, where we have real increases in title I funding, we also, however, want to make sure that at the end of the day we stay on track toward a balanced budget, that we are in a position where we are going to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse and wasteful Washington spending. We believe we have an excellent resolution. We think we probably will add a little bit more money to it, but this is just too much

to be able to pass tonight here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota, I respect his efforts. Some of them I happen to agree with. But at the end of the day we need to stay on track, we need to balance the budget, we need to provide robust funding for education, the environment, a variety of areas, and to show real compassion.

Furthermore, let me also say, of course, the thrust of our budget resolution is designed to take power, money, and influence from this city and put it back into the hands of the American people in every town and city and village across this country. We intend to do that.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct, so that we can rein in some of the excesses of the Republican budget, and stand up for working families for change.

The fact is, when we talk about the budget, we're not talking about a bunch of numbers and spreadsheets. We're talking about real people's lives.

We're talking about the elderly woman in my town of St. Louis, scraping by on Social Security, counting pennies at the end of the month—and already hard-pressed to survive the deep Republican cuts in Medicare.

We're talking about the young couple that is trying desperately to save for their children's education, and for their own retirement.

We're talking about the families that can no longer care for their parents and grandparents, but can't afford the \$40,000-dollar-a-year price tag of a nursing home without any help.

It's no secret that I strongly opposed this Republican budget, because it heaped all the budget cuts on those seniors and families—carving up Medicare and jacking up the premiums; cutting into education and college loans; paring back nursing home assistance to lavish more tax breaks on people who don't need them.

But today, we have a chance to help the seniors, children, and families who should be the foundation of any budget proposal: To prevent some of the deep cuts in education, at a time when we need more education, not less of it; to protect seniors on Medicare from being overbilled by their health plans and providers, when many of them just don't have that extra money; To preserve the standards that say your whole family doesn't have to go bankrupt to put your parents in a nursing home; and to do more to protect the clean air and clean water and environmental decency that are central to America's health and safety.

This bill would tell the Committee on the Budget negotiators that they have

to back away from the House Republicans' radicalism on those crucial issues, and toward the greater reason and moderation of the U.S. Senate.

The point of this bill is very simple: America's hard-working families matter more than any special-interest lobbyist.

The House Republicans' dangerous budget policies and Medicare cuts—already vetoed twice by the President—don't deserve another revival.

And together, we can start to make this a budget that actually works for working people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this motion—to protect seniors on Medicare, and preserve nursing home standards, and secure education and the environment. Even these changes won't make the Republicans' budget perfect, but it will send an important message.

That today, this Congress votes for families, for a change.

Support this motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to, for the one-billionth time, explain that Medicare continues to go up. We do not have any cuts in Medicare, we have real increases in Medicare. Student loans go up dramatically; in fact, nearly a 30-percent increase in funding for student loans. These are the things we are doing to set priorities for programs we really believe in, but at the same time get rid of those programs that do not make sense, that waste money, so families in fact can have a future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do rise in opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. From a procedural standpoint, this is a little bit like the poker player who, two poker players come to the table and one says, you put all your cards down on the table and show me what you have got there and I will decide whether I am going to raise the ante here or I am going to call you or not.

Let us not do that. Let us not put all our cards down on the table here. We are going into negotiation next week, a conference committee, with the Senate. We should not go into it with all of our cards out on the table.

Let us leave the procedural stuff aside. I listened to this motion to instruct being read here tonight. There are four parts of it, but I want to concentrate on the first one: to agree to the Senate-passed levels of discretionary spending. Sometimes I think my colleagues over on this side of the aisle are a little like the moth that goes to the flame. The flame is more spending, and they just cannot resist it, more spending, no matter where you find it, no matter where it comes from; if it is more spending, we have to do it. It does not matter that the budget resolution that we passed in the House of

Representatives protects such things as title I, protects such things as Head Start, gives more money to veterans' health care, gives more money to Superfund.

But this has \$5 million more in budget authority, \$4 billion more in outlays, it is more spending. Let us not worry about where it is, let us just spend more money. That is all it seems to be that we hear about over there; not how can we reduce the deficit, how can we get the budget balanced, how can we save our children's future, but just how can we spend more money. Quick, we have something over here that is more money. Let us spend this money. Let us go and advocate spending these additional dollars.

We are past that. Mr. Speaker, that is passé. That was the past. That was what we used to do. The time has come to say, where can we reduce spending, how can we do government more efficiently, how can we reduce the size of government, how can we send government functions back to the States and local people. That is what we should be talking about, not how can we find another \$5 billion to spend.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this motion be defeated.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 months late and two Government shutdowns later, this Congress finally got together and passed a bipartisan continuing resolution or a bipartisan series of appropriation bills just a few weeks ago. Now the Committee on Appropriations last Thursday agreed to an allocation of resources which is going to walk away from that agreement and take us right back to some of the same old arguments we had all of last year. We should not do that. This vote tonight is a test.

Some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle have made it quite clear through the last year and a half they want to eliminate the Department of Education, they want to make deep cuts in education, they want to make deep cuts in our ability to protect the environment, they want to savage job training, but then we had another set of our Republican friends who said, oh, no, we are not like that. We are moderates. We want to protect education, we want to protect job training, we want to protect health and protect our seniors.

Tonight is the night they can do it, Mr. Speaker. What we are asking the Members to choose is whether or not they are going to vote for a budget put together by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], which will still require major departures from that bipartisan consensus we reached just a few weeks ago, or whether or not Members are going to buy a different Republican version, that one being proposed by Senator DOMENICI and his allies in the other body.

It seems to me the choice is clear. If Members really are moderates, if they really do care about solving these problems in a bipartisan way, rather than putting us in the same old fights all over again, they will vote for this resolution tonight. This is not a radical left-wing resolution. We are asking Members to accept the judgment of their fiscal leader in the other body, from their own party. I do not think that is asking too much, if Members are really moderate and really do want to see bills signed, and do not want to see the Government shut down again.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this motion to instruct. I would like to correct what was just said.

Mr. Speaker, what we are being asked to do tonight is we are being asked to support the concept of the deficit going back up again in fiscal year 1997. I repeat, if we go along with this motion tonight, we will have the deficit going back up again in 1997. I do not think there is a single American out there who wants our deficit going back up again. The Senate bill asks us to spend \$5 billion more than the House-approved plan.

I did something special for tonight, I went and dug out our original blueprint to a balanced budget that we passed last year. Guess what, the House-passed plan already has \$7 billion more in spending than our original blueprint, and now we are back here asking for more spending yet. I thought it was time we got spending in line so we could get to a balanced budget to preserve this Nation for our children.

It is about time that we recognize that balancing the budget means more opportunities for our families, more job opportunities for our families, and more opportunities for them to live the American dream. That is what this is about. It is about choosing if we are going to head back off in the wrong direction again, let the deficits go back up again, start spending more money, watch this thing go back in the direction that led us down to this \$5 trillion debt in the first place. I, for one, am opposed to that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to strongly encourage the House conferees to hold the line on spending, stick with the House-passed numbers, and get us to a balanced budget so we can preserve this Nation for our children.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mrs. CARRIE MEEK.

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We are in the same circle of errors that we started the first time on the budget. It is almost like a pattern of dissent and disgust.

First of all, we keep saying we are going to take care of our seniors, but that is just a pious platitude around here. They really do not want to take care of the seniors, because of they wanted to take care of the seniors, they certainly would keep the nursing home safeguards where they were, because Members have heard of all kinds of abuse, we have heard of all the horror stories about what happens to seniors in nursing homes. If Members do not believe it, come to my State of Florida, and we can see this abuse happening to these elderly people.

Do Members know who these people are? They are our parents. They are our aunts and our uncles who get in a nursing home, and if we do not straighten our this Medicare situation, where the majority budget is trying to cut it, now they have a golden boy in the Republican party budget, he is just as golden as he can be, our champion, and he knows what he is doing, but he is not treating the seniors right. He is not treating them right.

What he is doing with this budget, he is going to lower the nursing home standards. They cannot keep it, and they do not have the money. They are going to go back to make the same mistakes. Why can we not keep the protection for senior citizens that we had all along against these excess charges, billing for things that are not even authorized? We are going to see that again. Why can we not protect these families, people who are being ruined as they pay for this care? They are being ruined. Their whole families are being wiped out. It is spousal impoverishment. They are making them citizens of poverty, and they have worked all their lives.

I appeal to the people to let us instruct the conferees in a way that is sound. It makes sense, and it is something that this Congress should do. It is not any fly-by-night, it is no way to spend, spend, spend. It is just like setting your priorities in such a way that you keep senior citizens well. The seniors of this country are hearing this, so we had better be sure that we look out for them, Mr. Speaker. Let us pass this to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, neither the House version of the budget resolution nor the Senate version is the correct way for Congress to balance the budget.

But the Senate version is clearly preferable in the protections it gives to our elderly citizens and disabled people who are in nursing homes. These protections are, of course, also important the children and other relatives of these patients.

The Senate adopted two amendments offered by Senator KENNEDY dealing with nursing home care. One amendment proclaims the sense of Congress that we retain the current law preventing the impoverishment of spouses by forcing them to pay for nursing home care. It also retains the current prohibition on liens on the home of a nursing home patient if it is being occupied by the patient's spouse or dependent children. This amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 94 to 6. I am happy to

learn that the majority's new Medicaid bill complies with this Senate amendment. So I hope that the House budget conferees will readily agree to this Senate amendment.

The other amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY was adopted by a vote of 99 to zero. It proclaims that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should continue to establish and enforce the Federal standards relating to the quality of care in nursing homes. While the majority party in the House is apparently willing to accept Federal standards, they have been unwilling to retain the current law that there should be Federal enforcement of these standards.

Some Members of the majority may not remember the nursing home scandals that arose when we left protection of the elderly solely to the States.

We tried that policy once. It failed. Don't try another experiment with the elderly. Do not sacrifice them on the ideological altar of States' rights.

Support the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida, that she refer to page 177 of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, where it has the language that protects our seniors. I would just recommend to the gentlewoman tonight, before she goes to sleep, that she gets the book and reads it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

□ 2045

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. I just make a point at the very outset that the past speaker from Florida, who I agree with on some things, and she is a wonderful lady, I particularly agree with her point that she says we have a golden boy that chairs the Budget Committee. He is a golden boy because he is doing what is right. It is to balance the budget. That is what the American people want.

Here we are talking about \$5 billion on top of \$494 billion that we are already spending, and we start breaking down the path toward balancing the budget. This is doing what is right. When you do what is right, you are a golden boy when you do that, and that is what the American people want. We need to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this. We are protecting the seniors, and we are protecting the kids.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. It is consistent with our coalition, our blue dog budget that moves to balancing the budget in a straightforward manner. But this motion also prohibits cost shifting to seniors under the Medicare program.

The Republican budget resolution would allow many doctors to bill the Medicare program as much as they wanted and the patient would pay the difference. What does this mean for patients? Under the current law, if a patient visits his doctor for a checkup, Medicare would pay about \$50, the price that Medicare has determined to be fair and equitable, and the doctor could not bill the patient for any extra amount.

Under this Republican plan, Medicare would still pay the \$50, but the doctor could then bill any additional amount, \$15, \$25, \$50 above that amount that Medicare is already paying. The extra charge then would have to be paid by our seniors. These extra charges could cost our seniors as much as \$40 billion during the next 6 years, yet they do nothing to ensure the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

The current prohibition on balance billing is solid policy for two reasons. First it has reduced extra charges to our seniors by over \$18 billion since 1985 and, secondly, it ensures the fiscal responsibility of the Medicare program and forces providers to be more efficient. All of us agree that the Medicare trust fund must be strengthened and that the program must be made more efficient.

Ledt us reform the Medicare program in a constructive and thoughtful manner. Repealing balance billing protections for seniors is just bad policy. It damages the trust fund's health, it potentially damages our seniors' health, and damages our seniors' pocketbooks. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the former Governor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I answer to the call of being a moderate. I am someone who has worked hard here, I think, for adequate funding for education, for the environment, for housing and other important domestic programs, and I believe that the Budget Committee and the Appropriation Committee in this year are acting in good faith to provide funding for these programs. I believe that our seniors, I believe that our children, I believe that our education programs, I believe that our environmental programs are going to be protected by the budgeting which we have this year.

So I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. I believe we must balance the budget. Earlier in this year, as the

appropriation process went forward dealing with the 602(b)'s, 28 of us over here on the Republican side signed a letter to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] asking them to be expansive with respect to Labor-HHS-Education bills and the VA-HUD and Independent Agency bills, and they have responded to that, I think, differently than last year.

I think we are in a situation now in which we can support the budget which is going ahead, but we must never forget that ultimately if we are going to help these children and these families and these senior citizens, we must balance the budget of the United States of America. That is what this is all about. We cannot add spending back into it, but we have to deal with the good faith efforts which have come forward so far.

I believe that it is unnecessary and unfair to demand that our conferees accept the entire \$5 billion Senate increase for domestic discretionary spending. This has been laid out very carefully this year in a way in which we can all manage. So I would urge all of us here tonight to hold the line on spending, and I would urge all of us to oppose the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted 10 seconds so that my chairman would understand my point.

The Republicans accepted the language concerning Federal protection in these standards but they did not say that they would enforce them. So just accepting the language without enforcement leaves a zero.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I want to thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding me this time and thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support this motion, but let me just give one reason, one part of the motion that deals with Medicare that I think is particularly important. The House budget resolution takes away the protection that our seniors have today, certain seniors, on their doctor or hospital being able to bill more than Medicare permits. That will require many seniors to pay a lot more for their health care as a result of that provision.

Last year the Democrats pointed out to the Republicans in their budget resolution the mistakes that they were making in Medicare, that it would cost our seniors more, it would take away their choice, being done in order to give tax breaks to basically wealthy people. Let us not make the same mistake again this year.

This motion gives us a chance, one chance, one part dealing with balance billing, to go along with the wisdom of the other body and to make sure that our seniors have the protection against

balance billing. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this and vote for the motion that is accompanying the conference report.

We have heard from the Republicans, we have heard from the Democrats. Let me quote, if I might, from two non-partisan private commissions that report to Congress that work for us. These are nonpartisan commissions that look at the health care system. Both have evaluated the Republican Medicare proposal.

PPRC has said "The absence of balance billing limits for services delivered in private fee-for-service plans and plans associated with MSA's could leave beneficiaries exposed to substantial out of pocket liability."

And PROPAC said "PROPAC is concerned that beneficiaries who choose the Medicare Plus fee-for-service option will be subjected to unanticipated out-of-pocket liabilities." But then the commission goes on and says "The Commission is also concerned about provider behavior resulting from these arrangements: Some providers may decide not to see those with traditional Medicare coverage by limiting their practice to patients who can pay high charges. This phenomenon could limit access of Medicare beneficiaries, particularly those with low incomes."

The provision that is in the House budget resolution will lead to different levels of care for our seniors. Those that are wealthy will have one system. Those that have limited income, most of our seniors, are going to be denied full access and are going to be asked to pay more with less choice.

That is not what we want. Our seniors already have the highest out-of-pocket health care cost of any group of Americans. The Republican budget resolution will add to that cost.

The Senate, the other body, at least recognized on balance billing that we must maintain a provision that has been in the Medicare system for a long time, that protects against extra billings by doctors and hospitals that our seniors just cannot afford. I urge my colleagues to support the motion that is accompanying the conference report.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct the facts stated on the other side. They are simply not accurate when they say that we will charge seniors more.

The fact is on Medicare, we are going to have spending go up from \$196 to \$284 billion. That is a 45-percent increase. On a per-person basis, it is going to go up to 34 percent, from \$5,200 to \$7,000.

I really believe in our proposal. The bottom line is very simple. We do not increase copayments, we do not increase the deductible, we do not increase the premium, and we say that under the fee-for-service system, you cannot have balance billing.

Furthermore, we allow individuals to have choice. If people do not want the

traditional fee-for-service, they can have choice, or a whole host of different programs. Under those different programs, they may get eye care, they may get dental care, they may have a rebate in their copayment, their deductible, they may even have their MediGap paid for.

The bottom line is when they are in their fee-for-service system, they get what they get now. If they get into private care and choose to, if they get into it and they do not like the plan, they can leave. They have 24 months, each and every month, to leave. So we give them choice, we do not increase copayment, the deductible or the premium. It stays the same. It seems to me like a very good plan. Plus we add 45 percent more to the spending on Medicare, from \$196 to \$284 billion.

We do the same thing with Medicaid. That goes up 46 percent, from \$95 to \$140 billion. That is a significant increase in spending. Only in this place when you spend more is it called a cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2¾ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Minnesota has 50 seconds remaining and has the right to close the debate.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct our conferees for three very simple policy reasons, and for three additional personal reasons.

The major differences are these. Our plan of the new majority brings the deficit down. To change course, to embrace this big spending the other side is so enthralled with, would drive the deficit up.

Second, our plan is real. The President and the guardians of the old order would need huge, unspecified cuts to finally deal with the deficit and eventually achieve balance.

And, third, our plan begins to control the explosive growth in entitlements, saving those programs by controlling the growth, not by cuts but by growth control.

Mr. Speaker, I said there are also three personal reasons and I wear them here on my lapel, Nicole, Hannah, and John Micah, my 3 children. I will not leave them saddled with a debt. It is immoral. Reject this motion. Embrace our budget. Embrace our future.

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

Mr. Speaker, to close the debate, it is really kind of simple. We have a real budget that uses real numbers. It lowers the deficit and it balances the budget by 2002.

The alternative, the President's budget. It got barely a majority of support of the people on the other side of the aisle. Why? Because it does not lower the deficit. It uses smoke and mirrors. In fact in the last year it has a tax increase.

Every time we pull the Democrats, and not all the Democrats, but we pull the people on the other side that like Washington, we pull them to the drinking fountain, they take a little drink and they buy into less spending, it is only about 24 hours later when they are trying to figure out how to get us to spend more.

We have a good plan, it has got the right priorities, it lowers the deficit, it protects our children and it also transfers power, money and influence from this city. The fundamental difference between Democrats and Republicans today is that we want to give people power back in their communities, in their villages, in their towns across this country, and the Washington spenders and liberals believe that people at home cannot get it right.

Well, as Republicans, we are going to fight, and it is going to be a long road but at the end of the day we are going to pry people's power and money and influence out of Washington bureaucrats and put it back into the hands of Americans across this great country and trust that they will get it right at the end of the day to solve local problems with local solutions and to protect their children.

Vote against the motion to instruct. Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct simply says, let us adopt some simple basic protections for the seniors and vulnerable in our society as it relates to health care. As it relates to the investments we make in domestic discretionary spending, we simply say, accept the Domenici amendment which BOB DOLE voted for. You can do it. You can do it within the context of a balanced budget which we agree that we need to achieve. But let us do it in a fair fashion. Let us move in the direction and not closing down Government again. Just simply accept the proposal offered by the Senate Budget chairman, a very Republican person, the last I heard, supported by BOB DOLE.

Let us be reasonable. Let us move on a course that gets the session ended. Let us not vote to close down the Government again.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Sabo motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution. The motion instructs the conferees to agree to the Senate levels for nondefense discretionary spending. Let me explain why this is important.

As we know, the President and the Republican leadership have both proposed plans that the Congressional Budget Office says would reach balance in 2002. Clearly, the President's budget illustrates that a balanced budget does not necessitate extreme and excessive cuts in programs of vital importance to millions of Americans.

The House budget resolution is worse than the Senate, making it harder to finance important domestic priorities in education and training, the environment, science and technology, and law enforcement.

The allocations to the appropriations subcommittees reflected in the House budget resolution have created the same basic conflict

that led to two Government shutdowns and 13 continuing resolution in the battle over 1996 spending. Why would we knowingly do this again?

Specifically, the House allocations are \$19 billion less than the President's request for nondefense programs, while at the same time adding nearly \$13 billion above the Pentagon's request in funding for defense and military construction programs.

For example, the allocation to the Labor-HHS—Education Subcommittee is \$6.7 billion below the President's request and \$2.5 billion below the levels necessary to sustain the 1996 program level. This allocation would likely result in significant cuts to such programs as Title I Education for the Disadvantaged, Pell Grant college scholarships, and the Summer Youth Employment Program.

The chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body clearly recognized that we were once again engaging in a train wreck scenario. Rather than push this to the brink again this year, he wisely proposed to add \$5 billion to the Senate domestic discretionary spending level to make whole the allocation to the appropriations subcommittees necessary to avoid unnecessary vetoes and further gridlock.

Although the Sabo motion would not even meet the President half way on priorities, it would allow funding at a freeze level for most program, funding at current services level for some priority programs, and allow modest investments in a very limited number of priority domestic investments such as biomedical research.

The Sabo motion does not fully address the fundamental differences between the Republican leadership and the President with regard to budget priorities. For example, the budget resolution would still assume a cut of \$61 billion from the President proposed spending level for education and training. Nonetheless, the Sabo motion would allow us to get through the 1997 spending bills with a much higher level of bipartisan support. In the short and long run, this would be a good thing for the American people.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is a classic example of the thinking that we sometimes hear from across the aisle. Instead of focusing on the policy goal, they focus on the bureaucratic program. Instead of measuring results, they measure resources and effort expended.

Over the past year and a half the Science Committee has witnessed a growing dispute about global climate change. There is perhaps even greater dispute about whether Mission to Planet Earth is the right way to study climate change. But there is 100-percent dispute—no body agrees—that the original baselined Earth observing system is the most cost-effective way to collect the data required for Mission to Planet Earth.

Only the gentlewoman from Texas—plus a few contractors and bureaucrats—seem to think that we should do this project the old and expensive way.

Several weeks ago the Space Subcommittee heard testimony from multiple witnesses that using small satellites to collect Earth science data would be cheaper and easier than the larger satellites currently planned for the Earth observing system. We have also heard testimony that the new commercial remote sensing industry should be able to save

us a great deal of money in collecting and distributing data.

So it seems clear that we can achieve the scientific goals of this program much more cheaply than is currently projected. But only if we allow budgetary necessity to be the mother of programmatic invention and reform.

Now it's no secret that I'm not a huge fan of this program, or of the scientific theories it may help to test. But that's not what's at issue here. The issue is whether we do this research affordably, within the context of a balanced budget, or whether we try to do it unaffordably, and break the budget and probably fail to do the science.

So why would anyone want to hang on to the old ways of doing things when that's not only more expensive, but in fact not as good? If we followed that logic—the logic of the gentlewoman from Texas—then Houston wouldn't be the hometown of the largest personal computer company in the world because we would all still use giant mainframe computers instead of PC's, we wouldn't have the benefits of using the new technology, and, of course, none of those jobs would exist in Houston.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Nation's science programs and the international space station. Over the past several years, the Boeing Co. and its employees in my home state of Washington have been working to help design and build the international space station. Currently, the space station is on schedule and on budget. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the space station holds great promise in the research of cancer and cell development, human physiology, biotechnology, fluid physics, combustion science, materials science, telecommunications, and new pharmaceutical products. With all these great promises in mind, I applaud the efforts of the Boeing space station employees for helping to advance our country's leadership in space technology. I look forward to witnessing the success of this technology and urge my colleagues to support the space station for countless generations to come.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I have some very serious concerns about the legislation before the House today, H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996. This bill cuts NASA's Mission to Planet Earth [MTPE] Program by \$261 million from the fiscal year 1996 estimated funding level and \$373,700,000 from the President's fiscal year 1997 request.

Mission to Planet Earth is NASA's long-term, coordinated research effort to study the Earth as a global environmental system. This program will expand our knowledge of the Earth and its environment, the solar system, and the universe through observations from space. The end product of Mission to Planet Earth will be the ability to develop and implement environmental policies based on a better understanding of how our environment works.

There are many reasons that global environmental change is important to our society. A single climate change event can cause global effects. For example, one major climate event, El Niño in the Pacific Ocean, has been occurring for hundreds of years on a fairly regular basis. When it does occur, it has a tremendous effect on weather patterns, causing floods and droughts in different parts of the world. Many researchers believe that the 1993 Mississippi and 1995 California floods were caused by El Niño. In the last decade, the pat-

tern of El Niño occurrences has increased tremendously, though we have not yet learned why.

The U.S. Government estimates that natural disasters cost the United States an average of about \$1 billion each week. Improving our ability to understand, predict, and respond to these events could allow us to find ways of reducing these costs and the loss to human life.

By using satellites and other tools to study the Earth, NASA hopes to expand our understanding of how natural processes affect us, and how we might be affecting them. Such studies will yield improved weather forecasts, tools for managing agriculture and forests, information for fishermen and coastal planners, and, eventually, an ability to predict how the climate will change in the future.

I would also like to make it clear that Mission to Planet Earth has always enjoyed bipartisan support. The largest budget element for Mission to Planet Earth is the Earth observing system [EOS], which will make two dozen different measurements over at least 15 years to provide the first long-term, integrated observations of the global environment. The program is estimated to cost approximately \$7.6 billion through the year 2000, and has already been reduced by 60 percent since its original approval by Congress in 1990.

This project was originally designed during the Reagan administration to study the full range of issues associated with changes in the global environment. President Bush formally proposed the build EOS in 1990 and Congress approved a new start for the program later that year. Since 1990, EOS has undergone three restructuring efforts, designed to focus objectives and approaches and reduce the overall program budget.

NASA has worked hard to reduce the costs of its programs, and I think those efforts should be commended. I support full funding for Mission to Planet Earth, and hope that my colleagues will join me in meeting the administration's funding request. In the long run, the knowledge we gain through this program may save a great deal of money and a great many lives. In my opinion, that is a fairly significant return on investment.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my views on the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act. I would like to state my support for NASA's space station. NASA has played a vital role in America's development, both in the advancement of scientific innovations and the implementation of technological breakthroughs. Often times, technology that is produced from these breakthroughs becomes integrated into our Nation's industrial sector. The United States receives a direct dual benefit from the space program, both in the fields of scientific discovery and commercial technological transformation. I envision great things in America's future scientific discovery. The space station will be the heart of our Nation's great innovative zeal.

I would also like to express my support for title IV of the bill which authorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to implement its National Weather Service Program [NWS].

The NWS furnishes the entire United States with forecasts and other weather information. This past year we experienced unusually severe weather conditions and the NWS readily provided protection for our everyday lives.

If the NWS does not receive sufficient funds, the agency would simply amount to a

data collection center. I am pleased to see that the bill increases funding for the NWS by \$19.8 million from fiscal year 1996. Nevertheless, the American people could still stand to lose out on the crucial services offered by the NWS. To that end, I support the various amendments which would bolster the NWS's ability to execute its responsibilities in a sound manner.

I support Mr. BROWN and Mr. WAMP's amendment which would increase the authorization for the National Weather Service. Additionally, I support Mr. CRAMER's amendment which modifies the agency, which, for example, would require the Department of Commerce to notify Congress on its decision to close, consolidate, or relocate any field office.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage the House members to vote for H.R. 3322, Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act. It is a good bill that authorizes vital programs and includes helpful language that effects the whole country.

This bill has provisions to update the language of the Unitary Wind Tunnel Act of 1949 which originally declared that the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of Defense should jointly develop a plan for construction of "wind tunnel facilities for the solution of research, development, and evaluation problems in aeronautics at educational institutions within the continental limits of the United States for training and research in aeronautics, and to revise the uncompleted portions of the unitary plan from time to time to accord with changes in national defense requirements and scientific and technical advances."

The field of aeronautics has received many advances since this act was last amended in 1958—almost four decades ago. Unfortunately, as we heard from expert testimony before the Science Committee, the wind tunnel facilities in this Nation are showing their age. The European countries, in a consortium, recently opened a new transonic wind tunnel which is technologically superior to any in the United States. This will have a direct effect on improving the competitiveness of European aircraft in the global market.

Mr. Chairman, the aerospace industry is the second largest exporting industry in this country, second only to agriculture. While just a few short years ago, the U.S. aerospace industry accounted for around 70 percent of the global market, recent reports show that we may have dropped below 50 percent. This loss of market share costs us billions of dollars in our trade deficit and each percentage point of global aerospace market lost by our domestic companies translates into about 44,000 Americans losing their jobs.

A study conducted by the National Research Council [NRC] in 1992 identified that our current wind tunnel facilities are inadequate for maintaining aeronautical superiority into the next century.

In 1994, NASA was directed by Congress to conduct a study of the needs and requirements of a national wind tunnel complex.

NASA currently is in the process of concluding this study of the technical, business, and related issues concerning the feasibility of developing the national wind tunnel complex. I fully support and encourage NASA to complete this study process, to assure that America's national security and international competitive interests in civil and military aeronautics will be sustained over the long term.

I am disappointed that President Clinton has chosen not to build the facility and provided no funding for construction.

In my view, the NWTC study takes on added importance at this time, in light of continuing budgetary pressures on NASA and other agencies engaged in aeronautics research and test activities, including the Department of Defense and the Federal Aviation Administration. Congress should also consider economic conditions in the aviation manufacturing sector of America's national industrial base constraining large-scale capital investment in research and test facilities along with the need to effectively integrate the NWTC with existing NASA, DOD, and FAA aeronautical research and test facilities and activities.

With this background, I believe that the integrated planning and organizational framework envisioned in the Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan Act of 1949, as amended, is a suitable and appropriate vehicle for the planning, development, and operation of aeronautics research and test facilities and activities in subsonic, transonic, supersonic, and hypersonic flight regimes, since all regimes influence performance, cost, and competition for civil aviation directly undertaken in whole or in part by NASA.

Congress has already made it very clear that before the first spade of dirt can be turned, there must be an agreement in place which includes substantial financial participation from both the private aerospace industry and the Department of Defense as they will be the primary users and beneficiaries of the project.

Any decision by the Congress to move beyond the phase 1 study is contingent upon NASA executing a memorandum of agreement with both the Department of Defense of the U.S. aviation industry, both commercial and military, regarding cost shares for construction and utilization of the complex.

With regard to the NWTC study, in light of the budgetary pressures, general economic conditions impacting the U.S. aviation industry and other factors noted above, I would hope that NASA will place special emphasis on the development and operation of additional wind tunnels at existing NASA and DOD research and test facilities.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SABO. 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 187, nays 205, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]  
YEAS—187

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Olver
Andrews	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Baesler	Gordon	Orton
Baldacci	Green (TX)	Owens
Barcia	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hamilton	Pelosi
Berman	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Bishop	Hefner	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Poshard
Bonior	Hinchee	Rahall
Borski	Holden	Rangel
Boucher	Hoyer	Reed
Brewster	Jackson (IL)	Riggs
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Rivers
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Rose
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cardin	Johnston	Sabo
Chapman	Kanjorski	Sanders
Clay	Kaptur	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Schiff
Clement	Kennelly	Schroeder
Clyburn	Kildee	Schumer
Coleman	Klaczka	Scott
Collins (IL)	Klink	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Sisisky
Condit	Lantos	Skaggs
Conyers	Leach	Skelton
Coyne	Levin	Slaughter
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Lipinski	Spratt
Danner	LoBiondo	Stenholm
DeFazio	Lofgren	Stockman
DeLauro	Lowe	Stokes
Dellums	Luther	Stupak
Deutsch	Maloney	Tanner
Dicks	Manton	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	Markey	Tejeda
Dixon	Martinez	Thompson
Doggett	Martini	Thornton
Dooley	Mascara	Thurman
Doyle	Matsui	Torkildsen
Durbin	McDermott	Torres
Edwards	McHale	Torricelli
English	McKinney	Towns
Eshoo	McNulty	Trafficant
Evans	Meek	Velazquez
Farr	Menendez	Vento
Fattah	Millender-	Visclosky
Fazio	McDonald	Volkmer
Filner	Miller (CA)	Ward
Flake	Minge	Waters
Flanagan	Mink	Watt (NC)
Ford	Moakley	Waxman
Fox	Moran	Weller
Frank (MA)	Morella	Williams
Frost	Neal	Wise
Furse	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Obey	Wynn
	NAYS—205	
Allard	Canady	Ewing
Archer	Castle	Fawell
Armey	Chambless	Foley
Bachus	Chenoweth	Forbes
Baker (CA)	Christensen	Fowler
Baker (LA)	Chrysler	Franks (CT)
Ballenger	Clinger	Franks (NJ)
Barr	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Frisa
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Funderburk
Bass	Combest	Gallegly
Bateman	Cooley	Ganske
Bereuter	Cox	Gekas
Bilbray	Crane	Geren
Bilirakis	Crapo	Gilchrest
Bliley	Cremeans	Gillmor
Blute	Cubin	Gilman
Boehlert	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Boehner	Deal	Goodling
Bonilla	DeLay	Goss
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Brownback	Dickey	Greene (UT)
Bryant (TN)	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bunn	Dornan	Gunderson
Bunning	Dreier	Hancock
Burr	Duncan	Hansen
Burton	Ehlers	Hastert
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Emerson	Hayworth
Camp	Ensign	Hefley
Campbell	Everett	Heineman

Herger	McHugh	Schaefer
Hilleary	McInnis	Seastrand
Hobson	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McKeon	Shadegg
Hoke	Metcalfe	Shaw
Horn	Meyers	Shays
Hostettler	Mica	Skeen
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hutchinson	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Myers	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Myrick	Solomon
Istook	Nethercutt	Souder
Johnson (CT)	Neumann	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Stearns
Jones	Norwood	Stump
Kasich	Nussle	Talent
Kelly	Oxley	Tate
Kim	Packard	Tauzin
Kingston	Parker	Thomas
Klug	Paxon	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Petri	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Pombo	Upton
LaHood	Porter	Walker
Largent	Portman	Walsh
Latham	Pryce	Wamp
LaTourette	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Laughlin	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	White
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Whitfield
Lightfoot	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Linder	Roth	Wolf
Livingston	Roukema	Young (AK)
Longley	Royce	Young (FL)
Lucas	Salmon	Zeliff
Manzullo	Sanford	Zimmer
McCollum	Saxton	
McCrery	Scarborough	

## NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Gutknecht	Nadler
Barton	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
Buyer	Jefferson	Quillen
Chabot	Kennedy (MA)	Quinn
Costello	King	Richardson
Davis	Lincoln	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	McCarthy	Shuster
Dunn	McDade	Stark
Engel	Meehan	Studds
Fields (LA)	Molinari	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Mollohan	Vucanovich
Foglietta	Montgomery	Wilson
Gibbons	Murtha	Yates

□ 2118

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ackerman for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: from the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of the House concurrent resolution and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KASICH, HOBSON, WALKER, KOLBE, SHAYS, HERGER, SABO, STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COYNE.

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks on the motion to instruct conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the House concurrent resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1997.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3540, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-601) on the resolution (H.Res. 445) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the distinguished majority leader regarding the schedule for the rest of the evening and week and the following week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed legislative business for the week. On Tuesday next, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider the number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through that list now, but a complete schedule will be distributed to all Members' offices.

Members should note, however, that if any recorded votes are ordered on the suspensions, they will be postponed until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, June 5.

On Wednesday, June 5, and Thursday, June 6, we will consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which, of course, will be subject to a rule.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business by 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have just two quick questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Does he expect to have the conference report on the budget resolution next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it is our hope that we would be able to do this possibly even by Thursday. Obviously, we have to see what we can accomplish when the Senate is back in town, but we are hopeful.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the other inquiry I would make to my friend from Texas is that we on this side of

the aisle have heard rumors that the gentleman may be considering adding a suspension concerning welfare reform. We are obviously concerned, since it is not on the gentleman's list, at least the list that we are aware of, and we have not seen this legislation.

So, my query to my friend from Texas is, will we be considering a welfare bill on Tuesday, a day which I might add, that Members will not even be in town?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that bill has not yet been written, but the gentleman should expect that it will be added to the Suspension Calendar for Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. For Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. For Tuesday.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am confused about that response from the majority leader, because when our staff met with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] today, he indicated that neither he nor anyone involved in putting that bill together had read the waiver request submitted yesterday and he said he was simply operating on trust.

Since my understanding is that the governor himself exercised some 70 item vetoes on the legislation that was passed by the legislature covering some 27 different subjects, whether or not the Congress is going to be allowed to at least fully understand what is in that package, and how those item vetoes have changed the package as it was originally passed by the Wisconsin legislature. Are we going to have adequate understanding of that before we asked to vote?

I mean, if this is going to be debated on a day when Members are not even here, and then voted on a subsequent day, I would venture to say that there will not be three Members of the Congress who know what is in the bill which they are passing on to the Senate.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, in light of the President's ringing endorsement just given recently of the Wisconsin welfare plan, we have the relevant committees in discussions with the State and they are preparing a resolution which, frankly, will not be that lengthy or complex or difficult to understand.

I am confident that Members who find themselves keenly interested in this subject will be able to make their way back to the floor in time to participate in the discussion on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that this is going to go through the appropriate committee before it is brought to the floor of the House?

Mr. ARMEY. No, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it is being prepared by the appropriate committee