

budget actually raises the deficit a billion dollars. Instead of being fiscally responsible and reducing the deficit, the Republicans are cramming tax breaks into the first 3 years of their 6-year budget. The deep changes in the projected growth of Medicare will turn the balance against our seniors. Life will be different for our seniors when they must pay doctors and hospitals up to 40 percent of the cost of their medical procedure and when rural hospitals have to close because they rely on Federal funds.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule and a "no" vote on this budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to yield myself 10 seconds to respond to the statements of my dear friend from Kentucky and before that to the statements of my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted for budgets which increase, at an even higher level than this one, the deficits over the next 2 years. They are higher each of the next 2 years. We cannot forget that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, actually the fact of the matter is a lot of us on this side of the aisle, and none of us on that side of the aisle, voted to cut the deficit in half in the first year of the Clinton administration by putting a gas tax on.

One of the reasons we got into all this trouble is somebody decided then they would lift it. Everybody wants to lift taxes and not cut programs. But the bottom line here for, I think, Americans is to hear this body talking about how we have to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, we have to do all of that, but we cannot balance the budget here.

Here we are considering a deficit that is going to be higher than the one we have this year. How can we have a higher one next year than the one we have this year and then stand there and say it passes the straight-faced test, to stand around and look at people and say, "We're really for balancing the budget." This does not work.

The real issue is not whether you are for amendment, it is whether you can get the deficit under control. I urge a "no" on this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise and thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me the 1 minute, and oppose the resolution, for many reasons, including the unnecessary deep cuts in the Medicare needs totaling \$168 billion.

I also oppose the resolution because it increases the budget deficit by en-

acting fiscally irresponsible tax cuts costing \$176 billion. After 3 years of progress on deficit reduction in which the President kept his promise in cutting the deficit in half, the Republicans now want to reverse the trend and add \$23 billion to the deficit next year.

Three years ago Republican after Republican came to this well to talk about the sky would fall if we passed the President's economic plan in 1993. Since then the deficit has been cut in half and millions of jobs created. Instead of continuing the work that was started in 1993, the Republicans want to give tax cuts and raise the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Republicans should listen to the majority leader now in the Senate, TRENT LOTT, who said that one solution to the budget problem is to reduce the tax cut. I would hope that we would remember that the budget is so important. We need to make sure we prioritize.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The membership should avoid references to Senators.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to echo the words of those that we have heard from this side. I, too, rise in opposition to this budget which unnecessarily makes deep cuts in Medicare, in agricultural programs—we just went through that bill—and others.

I say unnecessarily because it is not necessary to make these cuts in order to balance the budget by 2002. We have proven that through the coalition budget. You do not have to have the big tax cuts. All you have to do is forget the big tax cuts and then you do not have to make those cuts. But on the other hand, I see where Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican radical right, they not only want to make cuts in Medicare and agriculture and other things, but they also still insist on giving the big tax cut to the wealthy.

I rise strongly in opposition to the budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process.

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

Mr. GOSS. I thank my distinguished colleague from greater metropolitan San Dimas, Claremont County, CA, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess after listening to the commentary and the steady string and the balance of time, I am beginning to understand those polls that are coming out in the newspapers these days that show Americans trust Repub-

licans a lot more to handle the budget and economic matters than they do others. I am not sure what the Boston Globe is showing but then again, they do not always get the word up there as I understand there is a lot of snow.

I think it is important to say, yes, we could have done a lot more, and we will. Yes, we could have gone a lot further in this budget resolution. But I am extremely proud of this budget resolution because it goes a very, very long way toward the goals that we have said we espouse. It shows that we will stick to our convictions and that we will stay on a glide path towards balancing the budget by 2002, even in the face of election-year politicking which is creeping into this conversation, and despite the very manifest intransigence from the White House and, some might say, from the President's party in the people's House.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the members of this committee have demonstrated unending persistence, in my view, in presenting this budget. His hard work ensures that this Congress will keep faith with the American people, continuing on course for a balanced budget, something we started last year under the Contract With America and are moving forward in an orderly way.

Of course, we still hope the President will join us in this effort—it is not too late—taking the concrete action necessary to match his words of resolve that we hear so often and we fail to see the actions, as my good friend from California has pointed out.

Although President Clinton vetoed major components of our budget last year, we did make significant progress toward our goal of balance by our sheer staying power on this, enough so that this year we can still fulfill our promise that by 2002 we will no longer be adding annual deficits to the huge national debt we have and leave to our children and grandchildren and great grandchildren and their children.

This budget assumes the termination or privatization of 130 low-priority or unnecessary Federal programs, while outlining responsible reforms to preserve and strengthen Medicare. And, yes, I care about that because I am going to need it. I am getting close. And, yes, the people I represent are very interested in Medicare in my part of the world.

This is a crucial component needed to save that program from certain fiscal disaster, which is what will befall it if we stick with the status quo. In addition, this budget provides for revamping Medicaid and welfare to give greater flexibility and control to the States, shrinking the size and scope of the Federal bureaucracy so that people closer to home can implement programs to meet their unique needs. And this budget paves the way for tax relief for American families so that Americans can keep more of what they earn, a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, the rule providing for consideration of this budget is the

standard one for budget resolution conference reports and it deserves everybody's support. But while we are making progress—and we are making progress, I want to point out—just listen to our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

After 40 years of Democratic House rule and multi-trillions of tax dollars later, supporting even bigger bloated government, Republicans can report a major achievement to the American people. We now have the biggest spenders in the House publicly asking for lower deficits, and that is an achievement. We are proud that they have come around to that point of view. Now if we can just get them to ask for lower taxes, we will have indeed accomplished our mission.

I urge support of the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has given a very trying speech, but the still has to admit that this budget package that he is pushing forward raises the deficit by \$40 billion over the next 2 years after President Clinton has reduced it over the last 4 years.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule, and I do this on behalf of the millions of seniors across this great country of ours that will be hurt by this budget and its sweeping cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

The stakes in this debate are high, very high, because Medicare and Medicaid have provided essential support to our seniors so that they may live in some dignity. Today 37 million seniors depend on Medicare, and we in the Congress have a solemn obligation to make sure that they can count on it. People who work hard and save for a lifetime should have the chance for a dignified, a secure, a safe and a decent retirement, and Medicare must be protected.

Think about the difference that Medicare has made in the lives of seniors. In 1959 only 46 percent of Americas seniors had any health insurance in this country. Today 99 percent are covered. In 1966 the poverty rate for seniors was almost 30 percent. Today fewer than 10 percent of our Nation's elderly live in poverty.

Despite these great achievements, Medicare and Medicaid are one more time on that chopping block. The budget conference report that we consider tonight proposes \$168 billion in cuts in Medicare over the next 6 years.

These cuts are not to be used for the solvency of the Medicare trust fund or to contribute to the needed deficit reduction that we have been talking about. In fact, by their own admission, the Republicans have said that this budget resolution will increase the deficit. A number of their members have said that it will increase the deficit.

□ 2000

These cuts are to be used to finance tax breaks, including those that are

skewed, to help the most privileged people in our society. This is plain wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to reject these cuts. It truly is unacceptable for us as a society to sacrifice America's seniors' security and their standard of living.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget has a lot of problems, and they probably almost all stem from the fact that our friends on the other side of the aisle have tried to do it alone. There is no element of bipartisanship here and, as a result, the budget gets skewed. A small wing at the right end of the party has to be placated and, therefore, the budget drifts away from what the American people want.

Let me tell my friends we speak from experience. We tried to do a budget in 1993 without any Republicans, and while we were able to pass it and squeak it through, it ended up being, most people I think would say, a mistake to not do it in a more bipartisan way.

And so I would say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, rip it up, start over, reach out to the many of us on this side who have voted for a balanced budget, who believe we must balance the budget, and if we can do it in a bipartisan way, we can get a lasting document rather than a political one.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. A little over a year ago this battle was first joined as we began talking about cutting taxes, dramatically cutting taxes, even before we started locking in any sort of plan to balance the budget.

A promise was made at that time, because there were many people on both sides of the aisle who said the most critical thing to do is balance the budget, and the promise was made by the majority that we would not cut taxes unless, and until CBO certified that in fact we were obtaining a balanced budget; that we had everything locked in, all of the laws passed to get us to balance.

This budget plan not only increases the deficit by a net \$27 billion over the next 3 years, but the very first part of three reconciliation bills that will be sent forward, which tag a \$122 billion tax cut to the welfare and the Medicaid cut plan, according to the Republican numbers, will increase the deficit an additional \$33 billion. That is \$60 bil-

lion higher deficits through the first reconciliation plan. It is \$30 billion over the baseline in the Republican budget. That is what CBO says.

And the Republican baseline budget actually increases in the first fiscal year, next year, from \$130 to \$153 billion; the year after that from \$130 to \$147 billion.

And so here we are, promises made, promises broken, is the actual theme of this Congress, because we promised the people we would not go forward cutting taxes without it being part of an overall plan to balanced the budget. Reject this rule and reject this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOE KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think when we look at what is contained in this budget bill perhaps what is the most onerous and difficult to accept, aside from the mean-spirited cuts on welfare, the tough spirit that we have toward the cleanup of toxic waste, the limitations on student loans, the tax increases on working families while providing tax breaks to the wealthy, underneath all of these provisions is probably the most devastating provision of all, and that is the terrible effect that this budget will have on the veterans of this country.

Having served for 10 years on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and watching as we see a health care system for our Nation's veterans that has been chronically underfunded, seeing a \$570 million cut, \$100 million less in outlays, \$700 million less in budget authority, when we recognize that we did not ask our veterans when they went off to war, when they stood up for America, how much it was going to cost in terms of their own lives, we just sent them into battle. But once they come back, what we are not doing is we are saying that their budget has to fit within the budgetary aspects of all of the considerations of the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States.

What we say to them is a broken promise, a promise that said we will take care of your health care needs if you are willing to go off and fight for this country, but when you come back, what we are saying is we are no longer going to meet that obligation. What we are going to do is to see whether or not the health care budget of the VA fits within how much money we are willing to raise in taxes and fits into how much money we want to provide the wealthiest Americans in the form of a tax cut.

That is what is going on here. We will be sending veterans home, we will be raising the number of veterans that are not going to be served by this by 48,000 over the course of the next 10 years. Forty-eight thousand veterans are going to be cut as a result of the actions taken in this budget. It is an outrage.

We should reject this budget and we should send this budget back to the

budget cutters and tell them to cut somebody other than our Nations' veterans.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Jonesville, WI [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and commend the chairman for putting this out. I would also like to issue some praise for the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, tonight. I have the greatest respect for this man, of any man, and it is only after very, very careful thought and consideration that I rise to oppose the budget deal tonight because of the fact that I do have such great respect. And all the people in America should respect the gentleman from Ohio and praise him for the work he has done. But tonight I feel compelled, even with this respect, to rise and speak against the budget, because tonight we have an historical occasion staring us in the face.

In 1990, I sold my business to run for Congress because I had watched what past Congresses had done on balancing the budget. They had pleased the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, and in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act they were going to balance the budget by 1991. They went 1 year, then they went off their track and it started going back up again. Then they revised the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act and they went 1 year and it started going back up again.

I want to make sure everyone in this room and all my colleagues can see this because we are at this historical point once again this evening. Once again this evening we are at this point. We have been successful in our first year of reaching our budget targets, we have been successful at bringing the deficit down, and we have done it without raising taxes, like was done in 1993. We do not have to raise the taxes.

What are we going to vote on this evening? This evening we are going to vote on a bill that puts this thing going back up again. We are going to vote on a bill that sends the deficit from \$145 billion in 1996 back to \$153 billion in 1997.

I cannot emphasize how strongly I feel about this. I had a great business out there in the private sector, and I could still be doing that business, providing jobs for 250 people, but I came to this city because I knew that Congress had to be different if we were actually going to balance the budget. Tonight I ask my colleagues to have the courage of their convictions.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this happen. Tonight is a vote about the courage of our convictions to keep the deficit going down and to be different from past Congresses.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the last speaker for his wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us is little more than a repeat of last year's attack on rational national public policy. Tens of billions of dollars in overspending on defense, raising taxes on working families whose only sin is to make less than \$25,000 a year, and a large tax cut on the front end of what is supposed to be a balanced budget glidepath.

Think what happened to the Federal budget during the Reagan era. This chart shows the very low, nearly balanced budgets until we get into the 1980's. The 1980's deficits were touched off by an up-front tax cut and promises of future spending cuts, promises which went unkept. The result is \$5 trillion of accumulated debt to pass on to our children and to our children's children.

When we begin our balanced budget plan with a big tax cut, as this bill does, we invite failure.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is going to give me more time, so whatever we are doing we can come up with it. This is all I have of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman who promised those cuts after the tax cuts went into place? Who promised those spending cuts?

Mr. OLVER. The President. The President, as part of his plan.

Mr. DREIER. Article I, section 7 of the Constitution places all that authority right here in this room.

Mr. OLVER. As the gentleman understands, the Senate of the United States was in the hands of the Republican Party, his party. As the gentleman also understands, the bill was also, was also passed in this House by the whole of the gentleman's party, then in the minority, plus a modest number of the Democrats, not with the Democratic leadership.

Mr. DREIER. Has the Democratic Party ever passed a balanced budget?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Republicans then make extreme cuts in health care, in education, in job training, in environmental protection, in research and development, in public transportation and economic development, and they leave the Nation in the year 2002 with over \$6 trillion of debt and no revenue to pay it back because they have cut up front the revenue that would be possibly usable for paying that debt back, and that leaves us with \$240 billion at least of interest payments on that debt year, after year, after year, without hope of an end to it.

But such extremism really is not necessary to balance the budget. Both the coalition budget and the President's balanced budget prove that. So I urge

my colleagues to reject this rule and this blueprint for failure. Vote no on this rule and on the conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 2¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend, the gentleman from Tucson, AZ [Mr. KOLBE], a free trader.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The last speaker just said extreme budget cuts. We have heard that. How many times have we heard that? But we know that is not what we are talking about here. Let us keep our eye on this ball during this debate that we are going to have in the next hour when we actually talk about the conference report and not about the rule, and I will have an opportunity to talk about some of that.

But the bottom line is that we are changing the direction of government. My friends over on this side just cannot seem to come to terms with the fact that the election 2 years ago was about changing the direction of this government. And that is what we are doing with this budget, we are giving power back to people, power back to families, power back to states, power back to localities.

We are changing programs so that they are streamlined. We are getting the Federal Government out of these programs. We are putting more money back in people's pockets rather than taking it out, bringing it to Washington and sending it back to States.

□ 2015

That is what this is all about. It is not about a number, whether it is up a little bit, down a little bit. We know these numbers can change dramatically as economic conditions change. This budget is about changing the direction of government, and I urge that we support the rule and support the conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

Remember when your mother said "You can tell a lot about someone by the company he or she keeps?" Well, this rule is keeping company with a pretty shady budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority just can't keep its hands off Medicare. For the second year in a row, they are trying to pay for special interest tax breaks by forcing drastic cuts in Medicare.

After shutting the Government down twice and, after the near collapse of their legislative agenda you would think they would learn.

Well, my friends, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle remain clueless. They remain clueless that seniors are not willing to pay more to receive less.

They remain clueless that their plan will force hospitals to close all over our country.

So get a clue, ladies and gentlemen. Remember what our mother would say: Vote down this rule and reject it's pal, "the budget resolution" a resolution that harms our seniors to help special interests.

Vote against this rule!

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

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about reduction of deficit. I want to reemphasize so that all the Members in the Chamber and those in their offices will know. President Clinton reduced the deficit from \$290 billion to \$130 billion, a reduction of \$160 billion. That I want everybody to know. This budget increases the deficit by \$40 billion over the next 2 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, anybody who votes for this budget, amongst the other things it does, this does increase the deficit by \$40 billion over the next 2 years. I hope the rule is not adopted.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] earlier had criticized this budget as not being helpful to veterans. I guess according to the Almanac of American Politics, I am one of those Members, over the last 18 years, most supporting to veterans according to them.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is helpful to veterans. The President's budget recommends no improvement to veteran's benefits. That is a fact. This budget that my colleagues are going to be voting on has a number of improvements, including raising one-time auto allowances for veterans, allowing a surviving spouse to retain compensation, providing a \$500 scholarship for college seniors of veterans. It goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is good for veterans. I say to my colleagues, come over here and vote for this rule and then vote for the bill.

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

VETERANS

Outlays (billions) FY 1997 spending totals on veterans programs:

Budget Resolution Conference Report: \$39.561 billion.

President's proposal: \$39.557 billion.

Six Year Total on veterans programs:

Budget resolution conference report: \$234.271 billion.

President's proposal: \$228.088 billion.

The President's budget recommends no improvements in veterans' benefits. The Congressional budget agreement recommends seven extra improvements:

(1) Raising the one-time auto allowance for veterans with service-connected loss of

one or both hands or feet, or other severe disability from \$5,500 to \$10,000;

(2) Allowing a surviving spouse to retain compensation or pension payment pro-rated to the day of death instead of cutting off at the end of the previous month, as required by current law;

(3) Extending current law limits on payment of back benefits to surviving spouses of those who die while their claim is being adjudicated from one year to two years;

(4) Providing a \$500 scholarship for college seniors of vets with at least a "B" average under the GI Bill or the Post Vietnam Era Education Assistance Program (VEAP);

(5) Improve educational benefits by converting those participating in VEAP education benefits program to the Montgomery GI Bill;

(6) Making permanent the Alternative Teacher Certification Program, which encourages veterans to become teachers; and

(7) Funding the Pro Bono Program at the Court of Veterans Appeals.

Both the Congressional and the President's budgets extend the expiring VA OBRA 1993 provisions of current law; repeal the Gardner decision, bring VA liability for disabilities as a consequence of VA medical care more closely parallel to the private sector liability law; and repeal the Davenport decision (This 1995 decision by the Court of Veterans Appeals invalidated VA regulations that based a veteran's entitlement to vocational rehabilitation services on a finding that the veteran's service-connected disability materially contributed to the veteran's employment handicap).

For VA discretionary spending, the President's budget recommends \$102.2 billion in budget authority spending over the next six years, compared with \$107.6 billion under the conference agreement. But, the Clinton budget still does not balance. To balance his budget, the President would have to cut VA spending by an additional \$515 billion.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say in closing here that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do this almost, not quite but almost as well as President Clinton does when it comes to this issue of twisting and twisting and twisting.

The budget before this House balances within 6 years, and it has lower deficits each year than the President's budget, the budget that was voted for by my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

My friend from California talked about Medicare. The budget before this House does not cut Medicare. That charge is fiction. It increases Medicare spending from \$5,200 per beneficiary to \$7,000 per beneficiary.

This budget does cut taxes and we are proud of it. It cuts taxes for families. Mr. Speaker, 89 percent of the tax cuts go to families earning less than \$75,000 per year.

We have had the Congress controlled for decades by my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and tragically, they have never brought a balanced budget to us. We have done it for the first time in three decades and they have the temerity to come down here and criticize us for doing just that.

The fact of the matter is we need to pass this thing now. The big spenders are opposed to a balanced budget, even

though they say they are for it. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, pass this rule, pass the resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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—ayes 232, nays 190, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—232

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

Shaw	Talent	Watts (OK)
Shays	Tate	Weldon (FL)
Shuster	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Weller
Smith (MI)	Thomas	White
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Whitfield
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Wicker
Smith (WA)	Torkildsen	Wolf
Solomon	Traficant	Young (AK)
Souder	Upton	Young (FL)
Spence	Vucanovich	Zeliff
Stearns	Walker	Zimmer
Stockman	Walsh	
Stump	Wamp	

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—12

Berman	Frelinghuysen	McDade
Boucher	Gillmor	Moran
Calvert	Hayes	Rose
Chapman	Lincoln	Wilson

□ 2038

Mr. GORTON and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

MR. CHRISTENSEN and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 450, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, June 7, 1996, at page H6007.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

(Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last year we passed the first balanced budget in a generation. While the President vetoed that plan, this Congress has changed Washington forever.

The debate today and from now on is not whether we need a balanced budget, it is about the best way to achieve one. The plan before us tonight has one overriding goal: To save our children's future. It does so by empowering people to become self-reliant. It reduces the power and influence of Washington over our everyday lives.

□ 2045

Then it spends less while enabling families to keep more of their hard-earned money.

This Congress has already made dramatic progress. Over the past year we have fought for and won the largest reduction in Washington spending since World War II, a savings to taxpayers of \$43 billion. That amounts to a savings of \$688 for the average American family of four.

This budget will stop forcing our children to pay for our reckless spending.

It makes the most sweeping changes in 30 years by shifting money, power and influence out of Washington and back into the hands of the American people in the States and in their communities. Under this plan States would have the freedom to develop welfare programs that require work, that promote personal responsibility and break the cycle of welfare dependency. Parents, principals and local school boards would have the authority and responsibility for public education, not the civil servants in Washington, DC, local

decisionmakers, not faceless Washington bureaucrats, would have the power to design Medicaid programs that are tailored to meet the very special needs of the poor and the elderly.

And while we meet the Federal Government's important responsibilities, this plan helps America's families move ahead by providing for a well-deserved \$500 per child family tax break.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, this budget continues our attack on wasteful Washington spending. It eliminates over a hundred unnecessary Federal programs, and it puts an end to billions of dollars in corporate welfare and special-interest tax breaks.

Tonight I urge my colleagues to support this budget and continue our efforts to save the American dream.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I am not really certain what this resolution is. I know one thing for sure: It is not a blueprint for how we deal with the budget over the next 6 years. It may be a document for how we deal with the politics over the next several months, but I am not certain. But there are some things I know for sure from reading the document, and that is that it increases the deficit in the next 2 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I had the privilege of presenting a budget resolution in this House. The deficit was something like \$294 billion, and I do not expect my Republican friends to say that they were wrong and that our plan worked or anything like that. But I see this resolution which increases the deficit for the next 2 fiscal years, and I think back to 1993, and I wonder what would have happened if we had come to the House floor and said, "We have this great budget resolution that is going to reduce the deficit over the next 5 years. But, folks, in 1994 the deficit is going to go up; 1995, the deficit is going to go up, but trust us. In the last 3 years it will go down."

I think my Republican friends would have laughed us off the floor, and probably should have. That is not what our plan did in 1994. It brought the deficit down from \$294 billion. Now we are looking, and last we are told, \$130 billion in 1996.

But our colleagues come with this document that says trust it, trust them. They are going to raise the deficit in the next 2 years and then some good things will happen. I have seen those promises come and be broken too many times in the past.

So to my friends I say it is a resolution that is not going to work, does not do what they say it is going to do, but even after all of that, it still has all those little ingredients in there that is sort of mean to people, and there are different things that hit different ones of us.

I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] talk about what it does to veterans. I happen to

have lots of elderly women who live in my district, not very much income, income between \$7,700 and \$9,300; and I looked at their Medicaid reform, and their Social Security premiums are going to be up by over \$500 a year because they change the requirements of Medicaid. That is over 5 percent a year for people who are struggling to pay a food bill, and what I discover in many cases, worrying with these little changes whether they can continue to give 5 or 10 bucks a week to church, and those folks again are their targets.

So they have a plan that increases the deficit, is not going to work, but keeps picking away at the most vulnerable in our society. We should say "no" to this budget resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would choose to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the previous speaker, that there are two budgets before this House that the American people are taking notice of. One is the one prepared by the majority in this body, the other one comes from the White House. The fact of the matter is that in each of the 6 years covered under the terms of this budget resolution the congressional budget has lowered deficits in each of the next 6 years than in the 6 years covered by the President's budget. Lowered deficits in the Republican budget each and every year.

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, we heard already this evening, the very clear differences between these two budgets. These two budgets, the one presented by the White House, by the Clinton administration, and that one which has been prepared by the majority in the House and the Senate are very different in the philosophy they suggest for this country. I think our budget reflects what the American people said they wanted to have in this last election: less government, returning responsibility to citizens. But tonight I want to focus my comments on one part of this. That is the tax relief that we provide to families, the \$500 tax credit that we give to families, an opportunity to keep some of the money, their hard-earned money, in their pockets. We say, "Earn more, keep more, and do more yourself."

Mr. Speaker, we say that one should not have to send that money to Washington, one should not have to give it up, one should not have to take it out of their family's well-being, out of their education, their health care, their housing and recreation. They should not have to send it to Washington to support Washington's programs. We say, "Keep some of that money yourself."

And that is why this is so fundamentally different from the President's

proposal. The President's budget gives some very small amount of tax relief but then takes it all away, takes it all away in the year 2002 in order to balance the budget. It takes all the tax relief away. We say this tax relief should be permanent. We say American families should know they can have these dollars in their pockets, that they can keep this money so that they can spend it on what they know is best for their families.

Tax relief is critical to the growth, the economic growth, of this country. Tax relief is not just something to do if there is a surplus. It is about giving money back to people, about reducing the size of government, about saying that people have a better idea of what they do with the dollars they earn than the Federal Government does.

That is why tax relief is a critical cornerstone of this legislation, and that is why this budget conference report should be so supported by this body. I urge its support.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the budget before us tonight and would like to remind my colleague from New Jersey there is a third budget that we all ought to be supporting. This rhetoric of talking only about the majority and the President reminds me that there was one budget that received bipartisan support that reduced the deficit over the next 6 years. The budget before us tonight increases the deficit by \$63 billion over the next 2 years over the constructive alternative put forward by the minority side of the aisle. I do not know why we cannot bring ourselves to talk about the one budget that continues the 4 years of success of bringing down the deficit.

As someone that was here in 1981 that worked in a bipartisan way to help my colleagues on this side when their President, my President from their side of the aisle, was in charge, I only say this: "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." To buy into another budget that postpones 82 percent—82 percent of the budget deficit reduction is postponed until the year 2000, 2001 and 2002—how anyone can come to this floor tonight and say that they are serious about deficit reduction and talk about the President's budget that has been defeated, and the coalition budget that has been defeated, the only honest budget that reduces the deficit every single year starting this year and next year in an election year.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Because I am a little confused here, Mr. Speaker, because for a year and a half I have been

hearing about how the Republicans have cut too much. Now tonight I am being reeducated, and I find out that we are not cutting enough.

Can the gentleman from Texas explain it to a freshman who is confused? How do we on one hand cut too much, and we are too savage for a year and a half, and now I hear the ranking member saying that we are going too far. If the gentleman can clarify that point, I would appreciate that.

Mr. STENHOLM. I will be happy to answer the gentleman's question. For of the last year and a half all we have talked about is CBO scoring, CBO scoring, CBO scoring. The President finally submitted a budget that was CBO-scored and balanced, but that did not suit the gentleman, did not suit me.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And was it not back-loaded with cuts? Would the gentleman yield? Was that back-loaded with cuts?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. OK. My question is this: The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] was attacking the Republican budget, saying all the cuts was the end. Now the gentleman is talking about the President's budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. No, sir. No, sir. I take back my time.

Mr. Speaker, I take back my time.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute remaining. I will answer the gentleman's question.

What I am saying tonight is if my colleague is concerned about reducing the deficit, there is only one budget that has been before the House this year that will reduce the deficit by \$150 billion more than what we are considering tonight. We were precluded because we do not have the votes; that is clear. And for anyone to stand on the floor tonight and to say that we are concerned about the deficit and then look at the CBO scoring for the budget and the comparison with the coalition, the Republican budget deficit goes up to \$153 billion in 1997. The coalition budget stays the same. That is the bottom line and the fact.

□ 2100

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, this is our chance, this is our historic opportunity to return the future to our children, to give the American people more of their money back, to reform welfare and Medicare, to be honest with taxpayers, to balance our budget.

For all these very real reasons, I believe there is no more compassionate vote that we can cast. Every generation's success depends on us tonight, if we do the right thing. If we do the right thing, our newest generation will not be saddled with interest payments on the debt of nearly \$200,000. If we do the right thing, senior citizens will see an improved, responsive, and solvent

Medicare. If we do the right thing, today's working families will see their interest payments go down as tax credits for their children go up, all if we have the courage to do the right thing. Americans will finally see their dreams and believe in their hearts and souls that they will have the ability to reach them.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by stating that it is sad in this Chamber that we are debating another budget that did come up in the past, and unfortunately only 89 Members supported that budget, with the majority of the Democrat Members, including their leadership, failing to have enough confidence to engender their support. Tonight we have the majority of our Members on both sides of the aisle believing in a balanced budget and one proposal that will achieve that in the near future if we can in fact do the right thing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the newest mother in the House yield?

Ms. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman, she is looking out for her children, her child, but she is increasing the annual operating deficit. That is not balancing the budget, that is increasing the deficit.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, we have a budget that is compassionate, that reaches a balance by the year 2002, that restores tax credits to new mothers and families throughout this Nation. That will save Medicare for my little girl by the time she grows old. I am proud to vote for this budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. Slaughter].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. As a conferee, I am pleased that we were able to increase overall nondefense discretionary spending by \$3.5 billion over the House-passed resolution. But, make no mistake about it: This budget contains the same lack of vision and assault on investment spending, that we saw in the fiscal year 1996 Budget proposal, which has been rejected by the President and the American public. In addition, this budget turns back the clock on deficit reduction. For the fourth straight year in a row, the deficit has declined. Let's not reverse this trend and act to increase the deficit by \$60 billion in 2 years. The stakes are too high.

The overall adjustment in domestic discretionary spending is an improvement. But, the budget before us today still assumes a sizable tax cut for the wealthy; deep reductions in Medicare and Medicaid and critical investment programs to off-set the tax cut; and a sizable increase in taxes for working

individuals. The \$3.5 billion offers some relief, but it should be pointed out that if this 6-year plan is adopted, the purchasing power of overall nondefense discretionary appropriations will be 24 percent below fiscal year 1996 levels. This will require deep cuts in education, environmental protections, biomedical research, nutritional assistance, and criminal justice. At a time when we should be enhancing our investment in these programs, we are acting to impose an overall reduction of 24 percent by the year 2002.

While the agreement assumes tax cuts targeted to the affluent, it does not treat working families and individuals the same way.

You can call the cuts in the earned income tax credit an adjustment, but this adjustment will result in approximately a \$18.5 billion tax increase for working families and those individuals struggling to remain self sufficient. If we truly want real welfare reform that rewards work, we cannot reduce the size of the very tax credit which does reward work. This budget proposal is filled with these types of contradictions and inconsistencies. And that is why we should reject this conference report.

We can balance the budget without implementing radical and unnecessary Medicare and Medicaid cuts and dismantling the core social responsibilities of the Federal Government. I beg my colleagues to vote "no" on this conference report and send a message that extreme policies will not work. We can do a better job.

Mr. FRANK of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans know talk is cheap with a lot of politicians. I think it is good that we review what has actually happened in the last couple of years. Two years ago, nobody on the other side of the aisle was talking about the need for a balanced budget. They were saying, it was reasonable to borrow and spend for investment.

Mr. Speaker, let me review for the American people what happened about a year and half ago. Republicans took the majority. They cut \$9 billion out of the 1995 budget. Then in 1996 we had a budget that was \$23 billion less than the 1995 budget. This budget deficit has come down for these last 2 years largely because of tough decisions on spending cuts. The deficit was reduced in 1993 and 1994 because of a huge tax increase.

Let us review for the American people what is happening in terms of the real reduction in the size of the Federal Government. I think one way to measure that is as a percentage of GDP [Gross Domestic Product]. If we look at what happened in 1995, we had about 22 percent of GDP. In 1996 we had about 21 percent of GDP. This resolution that came out of conference committee has 20.4 percent of GDP. That is the lowest percent of GDP since 1974.

This is a budget that moves us aggressively in the right direction. In 1996 we passed a budget resolution that

said we were going to have \$4 billion more spending in 1997 than this conference report resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the tough guys as far as cutting spending. I voted for many more spending cuts in Budget Committee than were in this resolution. I said let us put pressure on this President and have the kind of budget that is going to be fair to our kids and our grandkids.

That did not happen because the President vetoed our legislation to balance the budget. Fifty-four million dollars' worth of publicity by the liberals ended up leaving many Americans in doubt. Some Republicans and a lot of the Democrats decided it was not politically popular to cut spending. Today let us really roll up our sleeves and just do it—this conference report in 6 years balances with a budget that is 18 percent of GDP—the lowest since 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote for this budget. Let us move on and get to a balance. Be fair to our kids, do what's right for America.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget conference report, House Concurrent Resolution 178.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric over the past 1½ years about balancing the budget—and we will hear more tonight.

I want to share with my colleagues a few facts rather than rhetoric.

While the American people are told that this proposal will balance the budget—the fact is that budget deficits increase dramatically and immediately in this Republican budget plan.

CBO currently projects that this year's budget deficit will be \$130 billion.

The Republican budget will increase the deficit next year by \$23 billion; and the year after, by another \$17 billion.

While Republicans increase the deficit by \$27 billion through the rest of this century the coalition budget cuts the deficit by \$72 billion. The Republican budget will result in \$100 billion more public debt over 3 years—\$150 billion more debt over 6 years than the coalition budget.

The American people are told that this is a real plan which will actually result in a balanced budget. The fact is, that 82 percent of the deficit reduction will only come in the last 3 years of the plan—after the turn of the century—when some future Congress will make the tough choices to achieve those cuts.

If Democrats, who actually cut the deficit in half in 3 years, had proposed this plan, they would be laughed out of this Chamber. I ask my Republican colleagues, if Democrats had proposed this plan, would any of you vote for it?

So much for balancing the budget—so much for cutting the deficit. Tonight,

Congress is going to increase the deficit and borrow hundreds of billions of dollars more from our children. Why? So they can pander to the voters with a tax cut 6 months before standing for reelection.

Stay tuned—in the next few weeks you will see more promises broken.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

Mr. Speaker, this budget plan is the only plan, only plan, that fulfills the commitment to balance the budget by 2002 with lower deficits than the President's budget in every single year. It provides a \$500 per child tax credit for working families. It in fact reforms Medicare. It preserves it and protects it, and it will extend the solvency of the trust fund for the next 10 years, a trust fund we all know is not going broke by 2002. It is probably not even going broke by 2001, but will go broke before the end of this century, according to the worst-case scenario of the trustees' plans.

It has broad coalition support from a large number of groups that represent the entire spectrum of thinking: The NTU, Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States Seniors' Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, and so forth, and so forth.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, give the new majority credit for finding creative things to do with cold leftovers. Mr. Speaker, the budget they are serving the American people today is nothing but a warmed-over version of the same misplaced priorities that were rejected and sent back to the kitchen last year. That is right; take away the sugar coating and you have caps on the direct student loan program, caps that will increase costs and add red tape, and over 7 million college students in the year 2002 will be left behind.

Minus the garnish, we end up with the same welfare plan, still weak on work, still tough on children. When we remove the trimmings on this turkey of a budget, we have another Medicare plan that will make seniors pay more for less while their hospitals close. And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, those Medicare cuts are being made in order to put the cherry on top of the Contract With America, or the crown jewel, as Speaker GINGRICH calls it: huge tax breaks for special interests.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a blueprint for balancing the budget, it is a recipe for disaster. I say to the new majority, they can keep their cold leftovers, their mashed Medicare, chopped children's programs, and rotten welfare reform. The American people want a new menu.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond to the last speaker who said we are cutting education, that we are cutting student loans. It is not true. Mr. Speaker, under our budget proposal, the total volume of student loans will go from \$26 billion in 1996 to \$37 billion in the year 2002. I do not know how that is translated into a cut, but it is not a cut where I come from, in Arizona.

We are going to save taxpayers' money by capping the Government-run direct lending program and achieve some savings from lenders in the guaranteed lending program, but we are not cutting the volume of student loans, and do not let anybody tell you we are.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, my third grandchild was born June 1, and as I welcome him into the world, I can't help but wonder what kind of future he will face. How much will prices rise during his lifetime? Will the country still be a place of opportunity? Will there be a thriving economy to support his generation?

When I think about the answers to these questions, it becomes increasingly clear to me that the best thing I can do for my new grandson is to vote "yes" for the conference agreement on the budget resolution.

We're a year into balancing the budget, and the sky has not fallen like some said it would. Our budget has matured over the past year, but the quality of the debate about it has not. We moved on while our critics hung on to year-old arguments that don't fit the facts. They claim the sky is falling because they know it is easier to generate fear than understanding.

Our budget is about conquering fear—conquering the fear that the next generation will have less opportunities than we've had. Over the past year, we've taken some good ideas and made them better. We've listened to our critics, and where they made a valid point, we compromised. And we've watched President Clinton distance himself from outdated ideas about big government and embrace Republican ideas as his own.

But let's be clear: There are some real differences. President Clinton raised taxes in 1993 and would raise them again in his latest budget. We provide permanent tax relief. President Clinton would increase discretionary spending over the next 3 years, and put off decisions about cuts to his successor. We decrease discretionary spending every year.

The most dramatic difference, however, is that President Clinton and our friends in the minority tell you to fear our budget and to put your faith in Washington spending and bigger Gov-

ernment. Instead, we take a view they consider extreme—we put our faith in the American people.

Protect our children's and grandchildren's future and shift power, money and influence out of Washington and back to Americans. Join me in passing the 1997 budget resolution.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why common-sense people would oppose this conference report. Just look at the \$158 billion cut in Medicare and \$72 billion cut in Medicaid, with all of the problems in that.

I want to talk about the huge tax increase on almost 7 million hardworking American families who have chosen work over welfare. The original House bill contained a \$20 billion tax hike and the original Senate bill contained a \$17 billion tax hike. Do Members know what they did? They separated the two and cut them up, so now they come up an \$18.5 billion tax increase.

They told us in the Committee on the Budget during the markup that this is essentially the same tax increase as the one in last year's reconciliation bill. The President vetoed that. That is history. This chart shows the details. As I said before, who will be paying those taxes? Let me tell the Members who is going to pay those taxes: 2.7 million workers with incomes below \$10,000 will pay a higher average tax; 1.8 million workers with incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000 will pay a higher tax under this Republican budget.

□ 2115

Look at it this way. Almost half of these workers have children. The Republicans are doing a good thing when they put in this \$500 per child tax credit, but they have taken it away. They gave back and they took away the rest of it.

I am saying that this conference report should not be passed by this Congress. We owe it to the American public to be sure that the balance budget is a true balanced budget and the tricks should not be tolerated.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the reason this budget should be passed this evening is not just numbers. It is because it has real effects on real people. Under the budget before the House this evening, real people will get to earn more, keep more and do more. That is what we should be all about.

If we listen to what the other side is telling us, remember what their economics is doing to real people. According to Investors Business Daily, under the Clinton economic program we are now back to a situation where the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.

Let me quote from *Investors Business Daily*. They point out that during the Bush years the average real pretax incomes for the very top income earners dropped, but they shot up in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration. As a result, the top 5 percent saw their average incomes climb more than \$30,000 between 1992 and 1994, a 21-percent hike, even after controlling for inflation. The bottom fifth, meanwhile, saw their average real incomes barely budge over those years, and they are about \$1,000 lower than they were in 1989.

The typical measure to gauge what happens to middle-income wage earners shows that their actual income has dropped slightly despite 2 solid years of economic growth. As for the poor in this country, we are now at 14.5 percent of the population at the poverty rate in 1994, the last year for which the data is available, and that is higher than all but 3 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations.

This is a program which is creating an economic disaster. The rich are getting richer, the poor was getting poorer, and the middle class is getting squeezed.

What do the Democrats tell us? The Democrats tell us that in their budget, in the Blue Dog budget, no tax break for middle-class Americans. Zero. Why? So they can spend more. And the Clinton budget actually increases taxes. They want to actually increase taxes and squeeze the middle class more.

In our budget, what we are doing is, we are giving a tax break to middle class Americans. We recognize that it is wrong to squeeze the middle class in the midst of economic recovery. We realize that what we ought to have is a situation where people earn more, keep more and do more. That is what we ought to be doing. That is how we affect the lives of real people in this society.

What the Democrats are telling people is that they are going to concentrate only on numbers, bring only numbers before the House, let the rich get richer, let the poor get poorer, and squeeze the middle class. That is their recipe. That is what the Clinton administration has been doing. We have got to stop that here tonight.

This is a budget that balances the budget over the next 6 years, that allows people a tax break so that we do not squeeze the middle class, that allows us to move toward a situation where people earn more, keep more and do more. That is what we should be all about in this society. Pass this budget, reject what the Democrats are telling us.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my friend that the reason the wealthiest Americans are doing better is they

are the ones who buy the T-bills and in effect loan money to the government, so that the rest of us can pay more in interest payments as the Nation gets deeper in debt. The budget you are proposing tonight increases the annual operating deficit and gets the Nation deeper in debt. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will remember, just a few months ago he voted to raise the Nation's debt limit from about \$5 trillion to almost \$6 trillion. I, on the other hand, did not.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, all of those debates seem to be about black and white, Democrat and Republican. There is a gray area called the Blue Dog Democratic Coalition budget that borrows less, cuts spending and the deficits immediately, and we do not hear much about it.

We tried to get it to the floor a time or two. There are not many of us, 21 or 22 at last count. We have tried to come here and master a difficult situation and not be held hostage by it, Democrat and Republican, black, white, blah, blah, blah. People are tired of that.

We have a plan, the Coalition plan, that begins deficit reduction immediately. This does not. This asks the American people to borrow more money next year and the next year and does not reduce the deficit until the year 1999 and 2000. That is not what our country is about. We are trying to get our financial house in order. The Coalition budget, as has been alluded to before, borrows \$150 billion less than this bill right now we are going to vote on.

It seems to me a clear choice. If we want to balance the country's books, there is a way to do it. As the Nashville Tennessean, one of my hometown papers, said some time ago, conservative economics and a compassionate government are not mutually exclusive. It can be done.

Twenty-three major publications across this country have recommended this to the Congress and we cannot get it to a vote. I wish Members would consider it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I look at the Republican proposal tonight and I see that the deficit goes up next year, not like the Blue Dog Democratic alternative which they refuse to consider. This reverses for the first time a 4-year downward trend of deficit spending, the first time we have had that since the Truman administration. This begins more deficits in order, of course, ultimately to do better. I think we have all been through that before.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] talks about real people.

Let me tell my colleagues about some of the real people who are really hurt in this budget.

The Republican budget is going to increase taxes on millions of working families earning less than \$28,000 a year. Their tax credit does not go to 33 percent of all the children in this country. Why? Because it is not a refundable tax credit. That means their parents do not pay enough taxes to benefit.

Who are the real people? They are seniors who earn between \$7,700 and \$9,000 a year, who are going to pay \$500 more because their Medicare premium part B will not be paid for by Medicare. Those are the real people who are hurt in this budget.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to focus on the real world, because I represent a slice of the real world, the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona. As a private citizen, now that I am a newcomer to Congress, I watched what happened here for the better part of 4 decades.

The real debate tonight needs to be put in perspective. Who is really balancing the budget, despite the articulate arguments of the minority within the minority that wants no tax relief for the American people? The majority on that side, the liberal folks, did not want to do a thing, did not want to touch it. The deficit would have been astronomical.

Now our President, who tells us the era of big government is over, does a little bit better but he does not really lower these deficits, nor does he provide the kind of commonsense tax relief that the real people of this country deserve. Instead, it is this budget resolution which delivers. Lower deficits, balancing the budget, lower taxes. That is reality, that is the truth. Vote "yes" on this plan.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I wish the chart were still up because I really get frustrated when I continue to see always talking about lines that do not represent the facts based on CBO.

Let me remind my friend from Arizona, a majority of Democrats voted, rollcall 177, for a budget that balanced and has the line going down in a true and honest way. A majority on this side voted for that budget. And quit saying they did not.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution conference report.

We will hear much today about the majority's \$500 per child tax credit for families with annual incomes of less

than \$110,000. But there will be omission after omission.

Because it will not be made clear that millions of American families who earn far less than \$110,000 will not benefit from the tax credit. Why? Because they earn far too little. Fully one-third of American families will receive no benefit at all.

Unfortunately, the majority will not discuss its \$18 billion tax increase on working families with children as a result of deep cuts in the earned income tax credit. Raising taxes on working American families trying to raise children on less than \$30,000 is plain wrong.

And unfortunately, there will not be much discussion about the 1.8 million children who will lose health care coverage as a result of the majority's punitive welfare reform package. And it is anyone's guess how many more children will lose coverage as a result of the majority's \$72 billion Medicaid block grant proposal.

Let there be no mistake, every Member in this Chamber cares about children. But this conference report is no friend of children. Support America's children. Oppose the conference report.

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that whenever we come to budget discussions and a balanced budget that the minority party seems to trot out the blue dog budget, which was created by 20 Members of the minority party and supported by not much more, in order to show that they are so much for a balanced budget.

It strikes to me the issue. I think what the American people used to decide is who is really serious about balancing this budget.

Now we come back to the budget resolution that we have before us. It includes tax cuts, something that I support and I think something that is very, very necessary in order to generate economic growth and get us to a balanced budget sooner, even if that means increasing the debt in the second year.

I am not real happy about the fact that the Senate stuffed about \$2.8 billion more worth of spending in this bill. But the American people need to realize who they are going to trust to eventually get to a balanced budget in 7 years. It sure as heck ain't going to be these people. It is going to be us. That is why I support this budget resolution and I support every other member of this conference in supporting it so that we can go on and continue on toward a balanced budget.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, once again our Republican friends demonstrate they do not know up from down. Talk is not cheap in this body, Mr. RADANOVICH, because the gap between the reality and the rhetoric that

has come out here tonight is several billion dollars extra this year and several billions dollars next year because you increase this budget deficit during all the time you have this great talk about trust and care and concern for future generations.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. No, I will not. With 1 minute to speak, there is the matter of correcting the misstatements that you just made.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. Regular order, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Texas does not yield.

Mr. DOGGETT. You have had your opportunity to misrepresent the facts, including the fact that only a handful of Democrats supported the conservative coalition budget when well over a majority of our caucus supported that budget. It gets the budget deficit down this year, it gets the budget deficit down next year, and every year until it achieves true balance. It does not talk. It has real action in the numbers and the real numbers.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. It does all of that without wrecking the Medicare system.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I know you want to let Medicare wither on the vine. You let Medicare wither on the vine.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Bill Clinton vetoed that budget, I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Regular order. He has not vetoed this budget, because it was never offered, and you know it, just like your last misrepresentation, sir.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The point of order is that two Republican Members in this debate have violated the rules by interrupting Members when they did not have the floor in a limited time. That is inappropriate, and I ask that you enforce the rules against it.

□ 2130

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that I would ask my colleagues to let the other side have their say. We do not want to be interrupted, we do not need to interrupt them, and we will have a good debate.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, and the members of the Committee on the Budget for doing an outstanding job in bringing this budget together and bring it to the floor tonight. Let me also thank and congratulate virtually all of my colleagues in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, because for the first time in the generation Members from both sides of the aisle, virtually everyone in the House, is debating how to balance the budget.

Over the last 25 years there has not been much discussion of this issue on both sides of the aisle, and that is the big change that has occurred over these last 18 months. The agenda in Washington is a lot different now than it was because we are talking about how to balance the budget, not the age-old debate that went on here about whether we should balance the budget.

For months Republicans in Congress have talked about doing the right thing for our children's future, balancing the budget, stopping the borrowing from their futures and giving them a chance to live the American dream. Why? Because today's kids will not be able to live the American dream if they have to pay back everything that big government has borrowed from them.

All of us have seen the most expensive credit card in the history of the world, a credit card that has a \$5 trillion balance and budget deficits of another \$150 billion a year for as far as the eye can see; \$260 billion a year is the interest cost on this credit card and we have all got one. It is our voting card.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the most unconscionable thing that we are doing to our children and their children because it will not be those of us in this Chamber that pay off the debt on this credit card; it will be our kids and our grandkids.

That is why over the last year and a half Republicans in Congress have kept our word. We have passed legislation last year that would balance the budget by the year 2002, that would have reformed welfare, would have saved Medicare for the next generation and given the American families tax relief.

But instead of being constructive, the White House and their liberal allies have waged a campaign of fear and demagoguery. But once again we are keeping our word and, unfortunately, we believe the White House is continuing to play games. No one in this Chamber can doubt the fact that the President's budget is nothing more than a joke. Nobody in this room and nobody in this town believes that we can balance the budget the way the President has tried to present to all of us.

The resolution that we have here before us tonight shows the hard work that we have all been at on both sides of the Chamber, and it also shows that we are able to have the courage to

make the tough choices that it is going to take to balance the budget by the year 2002. No gimmicks and no blue smoke and mirrors; honest choices, tough choices for the American people.

It preserves and protects Medicare for another 10 years. And if we do not do something, we all know what will happen. It is not only going to wreck Medicare for senior citizens, it will wreck the Federal budget in the future and provide more payments, more debt for our kids, and for theirs. This budget reforms welfare and it reforms Medicaid, moves power out of Washington and back to States and local communities where real reform can come, where we can actually be more compassionate in helping our fellow citizens.

But most importantly, our \$500 per child tax credit lets American families earn more, keep more, and do more for themselves and for their children. And ladies and gentlemen, if we are serious about moving power out of Washington, the way we have to do it is to move money out of Washington and allow the American people to keep more money in their own pockets.

As I said before, our opponents, especially at the White House, are playing games. Last weekend's Washington Post, I think, outlined it pretty clearly in Dave Broder's column when he pointed out the President is telling us and the American people he is willing to make tough choices to balance the budget, but in fact is telling his own administration do not worry about it.

Let us do the right thing for our children's future and pass this budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to suggest this budget the Republicans present tonight not only increases the deficit for the first 2 years but it is also loaded with gimmicks. The tax cut all of a sudden costs less in 2002 than it does in 2000. Medicare cuts explode in the last year.

Nonattainable. The defense budget increases in the early years in and then decreases below the President's number in the last few years. I could go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that fanaticism consists of redoubling your efforts when you have forgotten your aim.

The aim of the Republican Party is to reduce the deficit. They have forgotten what they were aiming at, and that is why the freshmen Republican foot soldiers have been revolting against their Gingrichian generals over the last 24 hours because the budget they have here on the floor increases the deficit.

They have forgotten their Holy Grail of reducing the Federal deficit. And why? Why? As the new majority leader in the Senate said today, because we do not want to touch the tax breaks for the rich. So, in other words, they have given up on the Holy Grail of reducing

the deficit in order to protect the crown jewel of tax breaks for the rich.

Now, I think if the American people understand this debate, they would want a no tonight on this Republican rejection of a balanced budget.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to merely remind the previous speaker and all the speakers on the other side of the aisle that each of the next 6 years the Republican budget carries lower deficits than the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we have been here and we have done that. These folks on this side has 40 years to get the finances of this Nation in order.

We are here tonight, we have presented a balanced budget. The first thing this side did when we took over was we cut \$20 billion worth of spending over the last Democrat Congress' spending. Last year we cut \$23 billion, and we have already heard the President taking credit for reductions. The only reason these reductions have taken place is because we have been here and we kept our word.

We came here and we did what we said we were going to do, and tonight we are going to do it again. We are going to bring the finances of this Nation in order. They may have to do it kicking and screaming and using false statistics and accusations, but we are sobering up and tonight is part of that process.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 10¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend from New Jersey, although he has disappeared, our numbers would show the President is actually \$100 million less in deficit than the Republicans are in 1997, so the 6-year claim, I think, is slightly off in the first year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rarely disagree with my good friend from Massachusetts who preceded me, but he was much too harsh toward the Republicans. He should not have chided them for voting for a budget that would bring the deficit up rather than down next year. They have learned.

Last year, they tried to impose themselves on the U.S. Senate, their colleagues over there, and what happened but a shutdown of the Government, a lot of political problems, a lot of governmental problems. They have learned the advantage of flexibility, of compromise. A year in Washington makes a difference.

The firebrands of last year have become now those who listen to leader-

ship, who back down, who accommodate. And when they are told we need to have the deficit go up, when they are told we have to put several billion dollars more in, when the Senate says that, the president of the freshman class says he does not like to but he will accommodate.

I do not think my friend should be so harsh. I think when the firebrands of yesteryear learn flexibility, accommodation, compromise, deferring to their elders across the hall so they can help the Presidential campaign of our recently departed majority leader, they should be encouraged.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, to whom God has given much, much is expected. These cuts in Medicare and Medicaid are simply unacceptable.

Well, I know my Republican colleagues do not like the word "cuts," so let me try this. This gutting of Medicare and Medicaid is simply unacceptable, especially when they are the result of a huge tax break for the wealthy.

This budget conference proposal cuts Medicare funds by \$168 billion over the next 6 years, and the Medicaid fund by \$72 billion. Approving this budget is promising this country that in the next 6 years the most needy people in this country will not receive health care.

Perhaps the most confusing of all these proposals is the cuts to student loans. More than 35 schools in my State, the great State of Florida, including the University of Florida, will be hurt by these cuts.

Let me close by saying once again to whom God has given much, much is expected.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would disagree a little bit with my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK. I would say that the Republicans did not hear, or maybe they did not listen and did not want to hear the American people when they said indeed that what they were doing in the budget was extreme. They wanted the deficit to go down, but they did not like their priorities.

Indeed, the Republicans refuse to hear because again they are cutting Medicaid, Medicaid severely, \$72 billion in the next 6 years, which will hurt pregnant women, hurt children, hurt those in rural hospitals. It means they have not heard the American people when they do not want these extreme priorities.

What we do on the budget says volumes about who is important and who is not, and what the Republicans have said through this budget resolution is if you are poor and live in rural areas you are not important; if you are wealthy and if you are healthy and you want to be in a health plan, then you have all the benefits.

I would say that is the wrong priority. I urge a no vote on this budget resolution.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], my good friend the ranking member, and I forget the name of that committee these days. It used to be Energy and Commerce. He does a great job.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, well, it is *deja vu* all over again, or, more likely, Reaganomics part II: Increase spending, lower taxes, and hope the big budget deficit goes down. But it does not.

Under the Republican plan, and I hope my Republican colleagues will listen to this, the budget deficit increases by \$23 billion the first year and by \$17 billion in the second year. After 4 years of declining budget deficits under the leadership of President Clinton, the Republicans have decided to change course.

I studied this well 3 years ago and listened to my Republican colleagues complain about the awful things that might happen under the Clinton budget plan. In fact, Speaker GINGRICH said it would actually increase the budget deficit. Well, the Republican budget deficit is going to increase under this proposal. They were wrong then and they are wrong now. They are fiscally irresponsible.

I would point out that this is a fiscally irresponsible budget. I urge my colleagues to vote no on it, and I quote a great former President of the United States, Gerry Ford, in describing situations like this, who said, "Things are more like they are now than they have ever been."

□ 2145

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk for my 1 minute about my Republican colleagues' mind-boggling inconsistencies. They say they invented deficit reduction; they come here with a budget that increases the deficit. They are suffering from amnesia or arrogance. Who was President when these deficits exploded?

And in 1993, many of us had the courage to vote for deficit reduction and every Republican voted "no." And one of them comes forth now and says under Democrats, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. But what are they suggesting? Increasing taxes on poor working families.

Now, Mr. Speaker, their message does not ring. There is economic prosperity under Democrats. We have to do better. We cannot trust the party that will make it worse.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am kind of curious what happened tonight to the House Republican voices who have been saying all week that it is wrong to pass a budget that increases the deficit over the next 2 years. Since those voices have gone silent tonight on the Republican side, let me say it: This budget increases the deficit over the next 2 years, and it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a month makes. Just last month, House Republicans bragged their VA budget included \$100 million more for veterans' health care than the President's budget, yet somehow between giving our Memorial Day speeches and writing our Fourth of July speeches, the Republican leadership cut VA discretionary programs, important programs for veterans by \$645 million.

One month ago, they claimed and bragged about the fact they were spending more money than the President's inadequate budget for VA health care. And yet this budget has cut VA health care dramatically by freezing VA health care programs.

Mr. Speaker, this budget will leave our Nation's veterans out in the cold, and it is wrong.

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this budget, and I remind my colleagues that we had a chance to vote for a budget that would balance without increasing the deficit in the short term. That proposal was supported by a majority of the Democrats in this House. That is right, a majority of the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, to hear my colleagues get up from the other side of the aisle and talk about it as if it did not happen sorely disappoints me. I do not understand why we cannot stand here and tell the American people the truth. I do not understand why we cannot stand here and tell the people what this budget will do.

I know why the majority will not do it: Because it increases the deficit before it brings it down. I read in the paper today, "It is like gaining weight before you start to diet: So it feels better." I heard that from a Republican colleague of ours. I will let that speak for itself.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, again we are getting to the end of the debate, and I think it is awfully important to have the record and all of our colleagues clearly understand that there was one vote this year, it was rollcall No. 177, in which a majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for a deficit reduction package that lowers the deficit, the total debt compared to what we will be voting on in a minute, by \$150 billion less.

Mr. Speaker, I too have a grandson, and I fail to understand how we are going to do more for the grandchildren

by borrowing more money over the next 6 years than if we just bit the bullet and started having some honest discussions about how we are going to meet some of the differences that we have across the aisle and do it in a more rational way, but that seems to have escaped us tonight.

But I think it is awfully important to understand that if we want the deficit to come down every year, not go up for the next 2, we do not vote for this resolution tonight; we vote "no" tonight. We go back to conference and we say let us get serious about deficit reduction.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution. We can do better than passing a budget resolution in 1996 that increases the deficit for the next 2 years. We have had lots of Members talk about how it can be done. It has been offered. It has been voted on. It has not passed, but it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I have had hopes through this session, starting back in 1995, that somehow before this year was over we would continue on the track we started in 1993 which involved very substantial deficit reduction and find some way across the aisles to pass a real budget for 1995 and now 1996 to put our fiscal house more in order, brought us to balance, made sensible and practical reforms of a whole series of programs which need to be done.

I told my Republican colleagues early on this in process that I hoped at some point we will get beyond ideology and would get to pragmatic solutions. I still have a glimmer of hope that somehow that can happen between the Congress and the President and before we adjourn in 1996. I tend to be an optimistic person. That optimism is dwindling week by week.

One thing I know for certain, and that is that this budget resolution and how it was put together does not represent that hope for a solution of our basic fiscal problems in 1996. It continues the ideology. It does not continue and move to pragmatic solutions to problems. I am not sure what happens tonight. I expect it passes. I expect it will be used for a variety of political purposes the next several weeks, the next several months. But somehow if we are not this year, we will be back to this problem in 1997.

We have to find answers that are real, that are pragmatic, not ideological. And, unfortunately, we are not moving closer this evening. I think we are moving further away. And I frankly think this country would be much better served if we simply voted "no" tonight and started all over again in real attempts to reach across the partisan aisle to face more problems that still confront us in this country. So I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, we came here 18 months ago to do a few things dramatic things:

balance the budget in real numbers; tax relief for America's hard-pressed families who spend more money paying off the tax man than they do on food, clothing, and shelter.

Mr. Speaker, we also wanted a strong defense. But we wanted to transform the very operation of this government by transferring power, money and influence out of this city. Now we hear all of this talk about all of these numbers. Let us get to the bottom line.

The President of the United States spends \$190 billion more, \$190 billion more than the Congress. And the blue dogs, they spend \$57 billion more over the next 6 years than we do. Know why? Bigger government. Bigger government. They believe in bigger government.

Now let us talk about the other side of the formula here. Tax cuts. Tax relief for Americans. Not only does the President spend \$190 billion more in Washington than we do, but he only gives Americans \$6 billion worth of tax cuts. The blue dogs spend \$57 billion more than we spend in Washington spending, and they have zero tax relief for America's families.

We not only spend much less, but we give Americans more in their paychecks. And, frankly, that is what it comes down to. About the size of this government and about the size of people's paychecks and about individual empowerment to let people keep their money rather than taking their money and giving it to government.

That is the bottom line. Mr. Speaker, if we want to tax more and we want to spend more, then defeat our resolution, but if we want a smaller Washington and less taxes, we come to the floor and we proudly vote for this resolution.

Now, last year we passed a \$23 billion cut in Washington spending. We denied the bureaucracy \$23 billion. Guess what? It had never been done before. Never been done before. I have been here 14 years. For the first 12 years we did not get a dime. But in the course of just 1 year, we brought the liberals who believe in Washington kicking and screaming in the trough, and guess what? At the end of the day we cut spending under the Republican program.

Now, did we get the entitlements reformed? Were we able to shift the power and the money and the influence and say to people locally, "We want you to design local solutions for local problems? Oh, yes, we passed it, and, guess what? The President vetoed it. Know why? Because he does not want to give Americans, he does not want to give Americans their power back. And neither do liberals in Washington. They do not want people to write welfare at home.

Now, I would suggest that we have got a ways to go. We have got to get these entitlements done, but I want to tell an interesting story. In Tennessee, Tennessee got to write their own Medicaid plan. They got to do what was going to work in Tennessee. And guess

what happened? They saved money, they saved the Tennessee education program, and they covered more people who needed health care. Know how they did it? They did it because Washington took their hands off of them and they let Tennessee design a Tennessee solution.

That is what we want to do with welfare. We want to tell people in neighborhoods that if Mrs. Jones is sick with a couple of kids, we are going to help her, but if Mr. Smith does not want to go to work, we are going to show up and we are going to teach him about work.

Mr. Speaker, that is what America is about. And know what else it is about? If Americans save and work hard and go the extra mile, they get rewarded. That is the Republican plan. It is about shifting power, money, and influence; not just welfare and programs to the poor and the disabled and not just saving Medicare by letting our senior citizens make good choices. But it is also about letting Americans have more of the money they earn to spend on their families, their children, their community. That is what it is all about into the 21st century.

No, we reject more Washington spending and we reject the idea of higher taxes. We are for less government, more tax relief.

Now, is this a perfect bill? Of course it is not. Are some of my colleagues upset we did not get everything done? Of course they are. And know what? I am upset, too. But what we are doing is historic, and we will get there. And for those who are frustrated, I just ask my colleagues, in closing, to remember George Washington. Because he was standing in a driving rain, he was standing in a driving rain and he began to wonder why he was doing what he was doing, because he realized that only a third of the colonists even knew we were in a revolution, and of the third that knew, only 10 percent cared. And of the 10 percent who cared, more than half were for the British.

Mr. Speaker, know what? They moved further as an army. They stayed together as an army with one goal in mind: establishing this precious Republic. And I ask my colleagues and my friends on the other side of the aisle to be part of this army to change America. If we stay together, we will get to the end of this long and winding road and we will save our children, we will empower America, and America will be stronger in the 21st century for what we did today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose House Concurrent Resolution 178, the conference report on the budget resolution.

The fiscal year 1997 budget resolution appears to be an improvement over the budget proposed by the majority party last year in that it scales back proposed Medicare spending reductions from \$288 billion over 7 years to \$168 billion over 6 years, and scales back the proposed Medicaid spending reductions from \$186 billion over 7 years to \$72 billion over 6 years. House Concurrent Resolution 178 also

reduces the size of a proposed package of tax cuts from \$345 billion over 7 years to something between \$122 and \$176 billion over 6 years. However, these changes do not mask the fact that the budget embraces assumptions that will reduce dramatically the role of the Federal Government in guaranteeing medical coverage for the poor, maintaining affordable health coverage for seniors, and in expanding educational opportunities for all.

With respect to Medicaid, House Concurrent Resolution 178 embraces structural changes to the program that will transform it from an individual entitlement into a block grant. In addition, the proposed structural changes to Medicaid will allow States to lower their contributions to the program without losing Federal resources; eliminate Federal disability standards that will leave States free to establish their own disability definitions; drop the requirement that health care be provided to children aged 13 through 18 living in poverty; and eliminate the guarantee that low-income seniors who cannot afford Medicare will have their Medicare premiums paid by Medicaid.

In restructuring the Medicaid Program, \$72 billion in proposed Federal Medicaid spending reductions could, when combined with State Medicaid spending reductions, result in a Federal/State Medicaid spending reduction over the next 6 years of as much as \$250 billion. Such a scale back will leave poor children, disabled persons, and low-income Medicare beneficiaries at risk.

With respect to Medicare, the budget embraces policies that will restructure the program to create incentives for seniors to participate in managed care plans and open medical savings accounts, and permit physicians to charge patients the balance above Medicare's set fees in the new plans. In addition, the conference report cuts the reimbursement rates paid to various providers such as hospitals, doctors, and skilled nursing facilities.

Managed care plans and medical savings accounts are not designed to address the needs of the poorest and least healthy Medicare beneficiaries. And, cuts to the reimbursement rates paid to health providers may well force marginal hospital, particularly in the Nation's rural areas and inner cities, to close. By embracing managed care plans and medical savings accounts, and by reducing reimbursements to health providers, this budget will, I believe, isolate Medicare's least healthy and least affluent beneficiaries at the core of the existing system, and force them to pay higher out-of-pocket costs for reduced levels of medical services.

House Concurrent Resolution 178 continues to assume that tax cuts, intended primarily for the affluent and underwritten by the less affluent, represent the best means of maintaining what many of my Republican colleagues describe as the glide path to a balanced budget. While this budget cuts the size of the GOP package of tax cuts, the benefits of the tax package continue to be distributed very unevenly.

Public and private studies, as well as innumerable books, have documented either how the gulf between the richest and poorest Americans widened or how the incomes of the rich grew significantly as the incomes of the middle class and the working poor stagnated over the course of the past two decades. Yet, the majority party insists on directing most of the benefits of its proposed tax cuts not to the middle class or the poor, but to the rich.

For example, the conference report cuts \$18 billion from the earned income tax credit for the working poor while providing increased capital gains benefits for the most affluent. It is a cruel irony that the majority party which insists that it wants to get people off welfare and into jobs would propose to cut the earned income tax credit that benefits the working poor, that is, individuals who have stayed off welfare by working.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Republican Party claim that they, not President Clinton and not the Democratic Members of Congress, know best how to balance the Federal budget by 2002. However, members of the GOP conveniently overlook the fact that it was a succession of Republican Presidents that caused the deficits to spiral out of control by first enacting and then maintaining the borrow-and-spend fiscal policies now known collectively as Reaganomics. In addition, they forget that every single Republican member of the 103d Congress opposed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act [OBRA] of 1993. Most of all, they overlook the fact that OBRA 1993 has not only managed to cut the deficits in half but also made the very idea of achieving a balanced budget in 6 years a distinct possibility.

I believe we can continue on the path to balancing the Federal budget begun by OBRA 1993. That path most assuredly does not lead to the dismantling of the Federal Government nor to the Federal Government's abdication of its responsibility to continue its efforts to ensure that all Americans are provided equal educational opportunities, adequate health care, and a decent standard of living.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference agreement on the 1997 budget resolution. Like last year's budget, the plan is out of touch with the American people and should be rejected by the House.

In 1993, President Clinton, working with Congress, began a process of deficit reduction that has reduced Federal deficits for 4 years in a row. In fact, the Federal budget deficit has been cut in half since the beginning of the Clinton Presidency. We need a continuation of the moderate proposals which have been working. We do not need another extreme budget plan to foster bitter confrontation between the Congress and the administration. The American people reject this tactic; they want bipartisan cooperation in solving problems.

The Republican plan proposes to cut Medicare by \$158 billion over the next 6 years. Even worse, the plan proposes to end 30 years of universal coverage for senior citizens and allow the healthy and wealthy to opt out of the program causing disruption and placing the entire Medicare Program at risk. Medicare cuts are still used to finance tax breaks for the wealthy.

The budget plan for Medicaid is even more extreme. Cutting \$72 billion over 6 years, and allowing the States to cut even more in State payments, would be severely destructive to the program. The plan also would eliminate the current guarantees of health coverage for low-income children, pregnant women, disabled people, and senior citizens. Thankfully, the President has already rejected this drastic approach and proposed a reasonable plan to cap individual benefits resulting in comparable savings without millions of Americans losing health coverage.

Likewise, the budget resolution includes much of the Republican welfare plan which

was vetoed by the President because it was too extreme and did little to move people from welfare to work. There appears to be little to recommend proceeding with the same plan encouraging a race to the bottom for State welfare programs.

With regard to discretionary spending, the budget plan is once again extreme. For 1997, funding for defense programs is increased more than \$11 billion over the Pentagon's request. On the other hand, nondefense spending falls dramatically—a decrease of \$15 billion below the President's request for 1997. Over the 6 years, the budget resolution would cut purchasing power for domestic programs by 25 percent.

For health programs, the budget plan calls for drastic cuts to programs like community health centers, family planning and biomedical research. The plan to cut purchasing power for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] is extreme and lacking in an understanding of the importance of investment in biomedical research.

The most extreme and short-sighted part of the budget plan is the limitation on funding for education and job training programs. Essentially, these vital programs to prepare the American people for the challenges of a new global economy are frozen for 6 years. The successful direct student loan program is capped, forcing 700,000 students out of the program in 1997 alone. This renewed attack on education places the Congress on a collision course with the Clinton administration, which has proposed \$61 billion more in investments for education and job training.

Again, the budget plan fails to adequately protect the environment. The plan would cut purchasing power for natural resources and environmental. The American people want the environment protected. They want clean water, clean air, and access to well-kept national parks.

Mr. Speaker, this budget agreement is essentially the same as last year's Gingrich budget. This budget sets in motion the same failed tactic of confrontation that resulted in the longest and most destructive Government shutdowns in our Nation's history. I fear that not enough was learned by the Republican leadership from last year's failures.

I urge my colleagues to reject this fundamentally flawed budget resolution and insist that a bipartisan budget proposal be adopted to move us on an orderly course to complete the important budget work of this Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this budget resolution because of its deep cuts in education. In the House Republicans' report on the budget for fiscal year 1997, they stated that:

[E]ducation is a top priority for the Nation. It is the means by which individuals develop the skills, knowledge, and sense of responsibility to pursue their own personal destinies and participate in their communities. It is the key that unlocks the door to higher-skilled, better-paying jobs for those seeking to break out of poverty. It is the source of highly trained workers, who are crucial to keeping the Nation competitive in an increasingly technical global economy.

Then why are my Republican colleagues seeking a decrease of \$2.1 billion compared to the freeze level for discretionary education, training, employment and social services programs? These cuts will include the elimination of 31 education programs including funding for

Howard University, Innovative Education Program Strategies, State Student Incentive Grants, and new funding for student loans.

Furthermore, they are seeking to cut funding for student loans by \$3.7 billion over the next 6 years. Cutting the job training and education programs by \$1.1 billion below the 1996 enacted levels. How can individuals break out of poverty through education if they cannot afford to enroll in school or receive job training.

Is this how they treat a top priority for the Nation that is the means by which individuals develop the skills, knowledge, and sense of responsibility to pursue their own personal destinies?

Now, I truly understand why I was taught growing up in Mississippi that you listen to a person's words but you judge him by his actions. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in November the American public will use my childhood lesson and listen to the words of the Republicans but vote based on their actions. Finally, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution offered today. This conference report represents a continued attack on the health, safety, and well-being of the majority of the American people. While not as drastic as the budget proposed by the Republican majority last year or the House-passed version of the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, this budget conference agreement also is too extreme. By cutting Medicare and Medicaid, the safety net for vulnerable populations—the elderly, disabled, and poor children and families—will be in jeopardy. I cannot support a budget that includes massive Federal spending for new tax breaks while other critical programs—including Medicare, Medicaid, and the earned income tax credit—are greatly weakened. This is not a realistic budget. We cannot, and should not, enact a budget such as this that promises to both cut spending and cut taxes. If we are serious about reducing the deficit—as I am—we should make the hard choices to bring our Federal spending in line. This budget, however, promises to make life easier for the affluent, while balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and disadvantaged.

I support a balanced budget. In fact, I have cosponsored and voted in favor of amending the U.S. Constitution to mandate a balanced Federal budget. However, while the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution conference report achieves balance on paper, I cannot support the callous and irresponsible policy assumptions it uses to achieve these savings. The policy implications have very real consequences to the citizens of this Nation.

I am especially concerned about the deep cuts in discretionary spending included in this budget. Certainly, we must take serious steps to carefully scrutinize every portion of our Federal budget in order to control Federal spending and bring our deficit under control. However, the cuts in discretionary spending included here are too harsh and will have a serious impact on millions of Americans, most notably the vulnerable populations that continue to be left behind as we change our Federal priorities.

For example, the cuts in education leave me very concerned about the future of this Nation. The education of our children must be a top priority. The education our children receive should be adequate in keeping the U.S. economy competitive as we move into the next

century. American children rank dismally in math and science achievement compared with students from other Nations. The proportion of young people completing high school has remained stagnant for a decade, despite the ever-increasing demands for education in the job market. Having all our students starting school ready to learn, increasing the high school graduation rate, teaching every adult to read and keeping drugs and violence out of schools are not goals we should abandon. While our deficit needs to be eliminated, we must not decimate the education of future generations, in particular cutting \$4 billion from our Nation's student loan program.

In addition, a well-maintained transportation network is essential for economic development. If highways cannot be maintained, our goods cannot move in commerce. Similarly, without continued attention to our Nation's airports, delays and other difficulties will slow our economy's growth. In addition, transit funding provides immediate benefits for economic development, carrying low-income people to their place of work and reducing congestion in metropolitan areas. This conference agreement would cut transportation funding in 1997, lower than its funding level this year.

Transportation should not bear higher cuts than other programs. The House budget phases out Federal assistance the operation of mass transit systems, and the conference agreement takes no position contrary to this stance. Operating assistance is essential to transit systems across the Nation. Transit systems are already taking serious steps to cope with Federal operating cuts of nearly 50 percent in fiscal year 1996 and 12 percent in fiscal year 1995. Transit systems, by necessity, are operating more efficiently yet still must cut services and increase fares. The complete elimination of operating assistance would have a drastic impact and could eliminate necessary public transportation in communities across our Nation.

The cuts in transportation funding is just one example of the hypocrisy of this budget. As this budget pushes people into the workforce it takes away their means of getting to work. This budget is unfair and should not be passed by this House.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution.

As with the version of the budget that the House voted on back in May, the budget plan outlined in the conference report is horribly flawed.

If it is flawed because it fails to address the Nation's most pressing concerns—concerns like affordable health care, high-quality education, community development, a healthy environment, and important investments in research and infrastructure that will increase economic productivity and improve our standard of living in years to come.

It is flawed because it irresponsibly cuts taxes and increases the deficit at a time when we should be addressing our concerns to balancing the budget.

It is flawed because it unwisely cuts spending for domestic programs in order to increase spending on defense at a time when the most important challenges facing the country are economic rather than military.

Finally, it is flawed because it cruelly redirects Federal resources away from safety net programs for the poor, the elderly, and the dis-

abled—and into the portfolios and safe-deposit boxes of the well-to-do.

In short, this budget has its priorities all wrong—just like the Republican Party. I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report and to start again. Let's put together a budget that invests in our future, maintains a Federal safety net for the needy, and reduces the deficit.

□ 2200

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—216

Allard	Fowler	McCrery
Archer	Fox	McHugh
Armey	Franks (CT)	McInnis
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	McIntosh
Baker (CA)	Frisa	McKeon
Baker (LA)	Funderburk	Metcalf
Ballenger	Galleghy	Meyers
Barr	Ganske	Mica
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Bartlett	Geren	Molinari
Bass	Gilchrest	Montgomery
Bateman	Gilman	Moorhead
Bereuter	Gingrich	Morella
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Myers
Bilirakis	Goodling	Nethercutt
Bliley	Goss	Ney
Blute	Graham	Norwood
Boehlert	Greene (UT)	Nussle
Boehner	Greenwood	Oxley
Bonilla	Gunderson	Packard
Bono	Hall (TX)	Parker
Brownback	Hancock	Paxon
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Pombo
Bunning	Hastert	Porter
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Burton	Hayworth	Pryce
Buyer	Hefley	Quillen
Callahan	Heineman	Quinn
Camp	Herger	Radanovich
Campbell	Hilleary	Ramstad
Canady	Hobson	Regula
Castle	Hoekstra	Riggs
Chambliss	Hoke	Roberts
Chryslers	Horn	Rogers
Clinger	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Coble	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Roth
Combest	Hyde	Roukema
Condit	Inglis	Royce
Cooley	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Crane	Jones	Schaefer
Crapo	Kasich	Schiff
Creameans	Kelly	Seastrand
Cubin	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Cunningham	King	Shaw
Davis	Kingston	Shays
Deal	Klug	Shuster
DeLay	Knollenberg	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Dickey	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	Latham	Smith (TX)
Dornan	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Dreier	Laughlin	Solomon
Duncan	Lazio	Spence
Dunn	Leach	Stearns
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Stockman
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Emerson	Lightfoot	Talent
English	Linder	Tate
Ensign	Livingston	Tauzin
Everett	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	Longley	Thomas
Fawell	Lucas	Thornberry
Fields (TX)	Manzullo	Torkildsen
Foley	Martini	Upton
Forbes	McCollum	Vucanovich

Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker

Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—211

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchesy
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann

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

NOT VOTING—8

Calvert
Frelinghuysen
Gillmor

Hayes
Lincoln
Manton

McDade
Wilson

□ 2220

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mrs. Lincoln against.

Mr. ALLARD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. COOLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report which has just been adopted.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to transmit herewith the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for the fiscal year 1995.

On September 29, 1995, at the close of the fiscal year, the Arts Endowment celebrated its 30th anniversary. A young man or woman born at the same time as this Federal agency's establishment has enjoyed access to the arts and culture unparalleled in the history of the country. The National Endowment for the Arts has helped bring tens of thousands of artists into schools, teaching tens of millions of students about the power of the creative imagination. This small Federal agency has helped launch a national cultural network that has grown in size and quality these past 30 years.

This Annual Report is another chapter in a great success story. In these pages, you will find projects that bring the arts to people in every State and in thousands of communities from Putney, Vermont, to Mammoth Lakes, California. The difference art makes in our lives is profound; we see more clearly, listen more intently, and respond to our fellow man with deeper understanding and empathy.

In these challenging times, when some question the value of public support for the arts, we should reflect upon our obligation to the common good. The arts are not a luxury, but a vital part of our national character and our individual human spirit. The poet Langston Hughes said, "Bring me all of your dreams, you dreamers. Bring all of your heart melodies . . ." For 30 years, the Arts Endowment has helped keep those dreams alive for our artists and our audiences. May it long continue to do so.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 12, 1996.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2951

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 2951.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2754, SHIPBUILDING TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 448 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 448

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 bill (H.R. 2754) to approve and implement the OECD Shipbuilding Trade Agreement. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on National Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No other amendment shall be in order except the amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. That amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from south Boston, MA, Mr. MOAKLEY, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2754, legislation to implement the multilateral trade agreement entered into by the President to phase out shipbuilding subsidies and create an international environment conducive to the restoration of a healthy commercial shipbuilding industry in this country.

House Resolution 448 is a modified closed rule, providing 1 hour of general debate divided equally among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and National Security. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The resolution makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute as recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, as modified by the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules, as an original bill for purpose of amendment. The amendment shall be considered as read. All points of order are waived against the amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified.

The rule further provides for consideration of an amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules and waives all points of order against the amendment. The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

□ 2230

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, some foreign governments have employed subsidies to protect their commercial shipbuilders from international competition. It was the policy of the United States not to respond in kind, and I strongly support that policy. Manufacturing subsidies are a wasteful drain on the economy and on taxpayers. We should not fall victim to these insidious policies simply because other countries employ them.

Seven years ago, rather than throw money away in a race to see who could provide the largest subsidy to commercial shipbuilders, the United States initiated multilateral negotiations with the major shipbuilding nations to come to an agreement to end subsidies. Mr. Speaker, this effort was supported by our commercial shipbuilders who realized that the only long-term hope for