

done as much as President Jimmy Carter in terms of lifting the concerns of homelessness in the way that he has done since he left the White House to a level whereby we all know that it is a critical problem and that we can make a difference, and we make that difference not only by asking for Government dollars to rebuild communities, but make that difference by making the kind of individual investments of time, energy, resources to try to make this a better country for all of us to live in.

There is also another thing I think we ought to be concerned about, and that is, in addition to building housing, how to build the necessary support services. As my colleagues know, in many communities many of the commercial strips are devastated, people do not have access to basic services because they have been left behind, communities have not been invested in, in many instances between insurance companies and banks. There has been a redlining process that has negated the possibility of these communities being as strong as they could be.

So it is my hope that what we do today sends the message that not only will we be building houses, we will be rebuilding commercial strips, and of course all of this means that we will rebuild the lives of people, rebuild the quality of life for all Americans, and in so doing I think this Congress will make the greatest of all statements.

I would like to thank all of those who have participated in helping to bring this piece of legislation to the floor and all of those who will participate not only in assuring that these two people will have homes, but also that all of America will be housed.

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

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to acknowledge finally two great Americans that have had outstanding contributions to the Habitat Program besides, of course, Millard Fuller, who is the president of Habitat and the hundreds and thousands, actually, of leaders involved in the affiliates throughout the country; our President Jimmy Carter, who has contributed so much of his time to provide a role model, and his involvement in the Habitat Program is well known throughout the country and is respected by both sides of the aisle, and the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, for without his leadership last year we certainly would not be able to move out of our committee and onto the floor for passage and finally for signature on the President's desk the first major public partnership between the Federal Government and Habitat for Humanity that will bring that dream of home ownership to thousands of Americans.

So my hat is off to two great Americans, President Jimmy Carter and Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH for their bipartisan support for a wonderful program, the Habitat for Humanity Program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 147, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)—

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 408, INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-103) on the resolution (H. Res. 153) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 408) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1990, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. General debate shall be confined to the congressional budget and shall not exceed five hours and twenty minutes (including one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies), with five hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and twenty minutes controlled by Representative Minge of Minnesota or his designee. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except the amendments in the nature of substitutes designated in section 2 of this resolution, if printed in the portion of the Congressional Record, designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each amend-

ment may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by a Member designated, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for twenty minutes (except as otherwise provided in section 2) equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments designated in section 2 are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of question shall be fifteen minutes. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

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

- (1) the amendment numbered 1, which shall be debatable for one hour;
- (2) the amendment numbered 2;
- (3) the amendment numbered 3;
- (4) the amendment numbered 4; and
- (5) the amendment numbered 5.

SEC. 3. Rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 is a modified closed rule providing for consideration of a historic document, House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1998, which incorporates the balanced budget agreement reached recently between the President and the congressional leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The rule is very similar to rules for the budget resolution in the recent past. The rule, not unlike the budget resolution itself, is the product of bipartisan negotiations and adequately reflects the spirit of fairness and cooperation in which those negotiations were carried out.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 provides 5 hours of general debate, including 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, or the so-called Humphrey-Hawkins debate. The rule also provides for an additional period of 20 minutes of debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE]. The rule then provides for consideration of five substitute amendments representing various contrasting points of view on budget priorities for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third year in which the Committee on Rules has required Members filing substitute amendments to ensure that their amendment achieves balance by the year 2002. In other words, we are staying on this glidepath to a balanced budget, and whatever is adopted here today will guarantee that.

Members are entitled to devise substitutes reflecting different priorities where a common goal should be a balanced Federal budget by the year 2002.

The substitute amendments shall be considered in the order specified in the rule, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to further amendment and waives points of order against them. The substitutes were also printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 19, Monday, and are therefore available in Members' offices today.

The substitutes shall be considered in the following order and are debatable for the following specified times:

□ 1415

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for 60 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for 20 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for 20 minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for 20 minutes; and the last substitute will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and will be debated for 20 minutes as well.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also follows the precedent of the 104th Congress and provides that if anyone's substitute amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole, that action shall bring the House to an immediate vote on final passage of the resolution, as amended. What that means, Mr. Speaker and Members back in their offices, quite simply is that there are no free votes here today.

The amendment process for these substitutes is not king of the Hill, it is not queen of the Hill, most votes wins, or any other creation; it is the traditional, old-fashioned amendment process in the Committee of the Whole. If any substitute passes, let me repeat this one more time, the debate will immediately cease and the House will proceed directly to a vote on final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House also suspends the application of House rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule on the debt limit. A separate con-

sideration of the debt limit issue is contemplated by the balanced budget agreement with the White House in the context of a reconciliation bill. For the third year in a row, we have squarely addressed the challenging issue of the debt limit and suspended this House rule which allows Members to avoid accountability.

Mr. Speaker, the rule allows for consideration of many of the various alternatives to this historic agreement that exists in this body. The rule will allow for a full day of deliberation and votes on these differing blueprints of our Nation's fiscal priorities.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to a friend of his in 1816, gave the following charge. He said: To preserve people's independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. That was way back in 1816.

He went on to say: We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Today, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan manner, will act upon Jefferson's advice back in 1816. Let it be recognized that at the end of this day, the House will pass a bipartisanly supported balanced budget, something I admit that I never thought would happen in my 20 years here. This dramatic shift in the fiscal direction of our country is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of that Committee on the Budget. They, and others who worked with them, deserve our commendation here today.

Now with respect to the actual budget before us, I would like to make a few observations. First, this balanced budget agreement does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member. In fact, I can say with certainty that every Member in this House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making the decisions. I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had much deeper spending cuts, much more tax cuts, more entitlement reform, and more spending for defense. Those are all my priorities.

However, it is important to point out again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and process. That is what Ronald Reagan spent years trying to teach me, and it took a long time to sink in, because I see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] sitting over there, and we all think that our infinite wisdom is the best and that everybody ought to do exactly what we think.

This compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. Indeed, this budget reflects the charge of Jefferson enduring more economy and more liberty.

Second, on balance, I think this is a good budget, it is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts; not temporary, permanent. These are specific changes written into the law, something radically different from the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements, such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. We all know what happened with those, because there were no permanent spending cuts and there were no permanent tax cuts.

Last night up in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] elaborated on just how far we have come. I think my colleagues ought to listen to these facts. First, this agreement balances the budget for the first time in 30 years, and for only the second time in the last 40 years. Then we wonder how we got ourselves into this deficit mess we are in today. Government spending will be less, listen to this, less than 20 percent of the gross domestic product for the first time since 1974. That is 22 years ago. America will save, and my colleagues ought to listen to this, some conservatives who are like me, America will save \$600 billion over the next 5 years in entitlement spending.

That means entitlement reform, I say to my colleagues, the fastest-growing portion of this budget. Nondefense discretionary spending will grow at a rate of one-half of one percent a year over the next 5 years. How is that different? Because over the last 5 years, it has grown by 6 percent.

Now, the next 5 years it is going to grow by less than half of one percent, and contrary to what some have asserted, this budget is built on conservative assumptions that the economy will grow at 2.1 percent over the next 5 years, that unemployment will rise to 6 percent, and that the consumer price index will continue to go up. However, the economy has actually been growing stronger, reaching 5.6 percent in the last quarter, so we can see the differences here. The unemployment rate has remained below 4.9 percent, not 6 percent, as is projected in this budget agreement. So those mean real, real changes. The CPI may actually be going down.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is built on sound economic assumptions as well as a strong and vibrant national economy. Furthermore, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, has stated that balancing the budget will further improve the performance of the economy, which will make these figures even more important. This is not a budget of rosy scenarios and numbers games, this is an honest fiscal blueprint, and if this fiscal conservative is standing here telling you this, I think you can believe it.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this budget resolution, and the reconciliation bills that follow it, are perhaps the most important bills we will pass this Congress, important in the sense that they will directly benefit every single

American family in this country. We owe it to those families to pass this budget today, and once that is done, we face the difficult task of summoning the courage to vote yes on the enabling authorization and appropriation measures that will cut spending, cut taxes, and cut the deficits that are bankrupting future generations of America and turning this country into nothing more than a debtor Nation.

I, for one, stand here today and pledge right now that I will vote for every one of those spending cuts that is going to live up to this very, very difficult agreement. This budget is a victory for America's children, and I believe something this Congress and even this President should be proud to support. I urge my colleagues to follow Thomas Jefferson's instructions, to improve independence, to preserve independence, and maximize liberty by supporting this rule and supporting this balanced budget agreement today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my formal remarks, I have a question for the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question is, is this rule a moving target? There evidently is some controversy on your side, continuing controversy on your side, as to whether the Minge amendment should be made in order. It is not currently made in order under the rule, and I would ask the gentleman whether he contemplates asking the House to amend the rule to make the Minge amendment in order.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend from Texas, [Mr. FROST], that we have that under consideration. As the gentleman knows, there has been evidently a misunderstanding as far as the Minge substitute, which is the better-known blue dog substitute, whether that was supposed to have been made in order or not. As the gentleman knows, there were 20 minutes of debate set aside during the general debate time for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and his associates.

There are conversations going on now with the Republican leadership, the Democrat leadership, to find out how we might remedy the misunderstanding. Unfortunately, we probably will not know that for another 15 or 20 minutes, but I would hope to receive some direction in the next 10 or 15 minutes and I will be glad to enlighten the gentleman as soon as I am enlightened myself.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, so it is possible that the gentleman will seek to amend the rule, either by unanimous consent or by motion, at some point during this hour?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there is that possibility, but again negotiations and communications are going on, on both sides of the aisle, and I will let the gentleman know as soon as possible.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, again, as the gentleman knows, that the Members on my side of the aisle moved in the Committee on Rules last night that the Minge amendment be made in order and that that was rejected on a straight party line vote. It would be helpful, Mr. Speaker, for us to have some degree of notice as to what the rule really is. This really handicaps debate, not knowing what we are debating.

So I would urge the disagreement on the Republican side, between one group of Republicans and the other group of Republicans, to be resolved as quickly as possible, so that we may know what rule we are dealing with.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman points out that all disagreement is on this side, but I would just inform the gentleman, or recall to him that the President of the United States does not support the Minge amendment, and has asked for no amendments in effect to have been made in order to pass on this floor, so it is not just the Republicans, it is the Republicans and Democrats that are trying to work out this problem to make sure that we do not break this agreement. It is terribly important we keep the agreement together.

The gentleman knows I happen to support the Minge amendment and would like to see it made in order, and hopefully we can do that but we will have to wait and see.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the disagreement between one group of Republicans and the other can be resolved as quickly as possible so that we can know what rule we are debating.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us gives Members of the House the opportunity to make a choice on how best to balance the Federal budget in the next 5 years. In addition to the text of the budget resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget, the rule makes in order five substitutes which address different budgeting priorities. Each substitute offers an alternative to the agreement negotiated between the Republican leadership and the President.

I would like to point out, however, that the rule does not, as I just mentioned, does not make in order a substitute which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], brought to the committee on behalf of the coalition. During our consideration of this resolution in the Committee on Rules last night, I offered an amendment to the rule which would have allowed the coa-

lition substitute to be considered today. That amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

While the rule does give the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] 20 minutes of debate time in order to explain the coalition's position, it is indeed unfortunate that the Republican majority did not make his substitute in order last night.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the rule does make five substitutes in order. The first, which will be offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is an alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. This substitute provides for no tax cuts until after the year 2002, and meanwhile, provides increased funding for domestic discretionary programs as well as fewer cuts in Medicaid or Medicare.

The second substitute offered by the gentleman from California takes the opposite tack of the Waters substitute. This proposal reduces nondefense discretionary spending by an additional \$109 billion over the 5 years and uses those freed-up funds for additional tax cuts.

□ 1430

The third alternative will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]. The Brown substitute increases nondefense discretionary outlays and makes no provision for tax cuts until after the year 2002. The focus of the Brown substitute is on investment spending for economic growth in such areas as research and development, transportation, and education and training.

The fourth alternative, which will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], cuts less from Medicare and spends more on domestic discretionary programs than does the Committee on the Budget recommendation. The Kennedy substitute provides \$100 billion more for health, education, transportation, research and development, economic development programs, than does the budget agreement. The Kennedy substitute provides \$60 billion in tax cuts over the 5 years compared with the \$85 billion recommended in the committee resolution.

The fifth and final alternative, to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], increases spending on transportation programs by \$12 billion over the amount provided in the budget agreement. These increases are offset by across-the-board reductions in discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense, as well as by a reduction in the tax cuts provided in the committee resolution.

As Members can see, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have offered distinct alternatives to the budget agreement. Each provides a different means of achieving the goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002. But all Members should take careful note of how this rule is structured. If any of these

alternatives is adopted, then the House will have finally spoken and no other alternative will be voted on, nor will the committee resolution be voted on.

In other words, if, for instance, the Brown substitute receives a majority vote, then the House will never vote on either the Kennedy or Shuster substitute or the committee bill.

I urge my colleagues to listen very carefully to the debate over the course of the next few hours. The decisions we make here today will affect every man, woman, and child in this great country of ours. The votes we cast today are, however, only the first step toward implementing a plan to balance the budget. The really hard votes are yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, even if we pass a plan tonight or sometime early tomorrow, all we have done is establish a framework. No Member is obligated to support legislation implementing this plan if he or she ultimately considers it unfair or ill-conceived. Members will need to examine the reconciliation package that emerges from the committees of the House later this summer very carefully to ensure that their provisions do not unfairly affect one segment of our population in order to provide gain or benefit to a few.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what decision the House reaches today, let us be sure that in the coming weeks and months that the decisions we make in implementing a balanced budget plan are fair and equitable and benefit all Americans.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Westchester, OH [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and share my views about this important rule. Let me congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the members of the Committee on Rules for putting together a rule that will provide for a fair and open debate from many different viewpoints on this issue of the budget.

Today really is another historic day in this Congress, another milestone in the 33 months that Republicans have controlled this House. Last year, we passed historic reforms like welfare reform, trying to bring dignity back to American families and encourage those on welfare to help them become more productive members of our society. We passed illegal immigration reform, health care reform. We eliminated some 300 Federal Government programs and reduced spending by \$53 billion over those 2 years.

Today is another step in the direction of a smaller, less costly, less intrusive government here in Washington, when we pass a resolution to balance the Federal budget over the next 5 years. Balancing the Federal budget will bring fiscal responsibility to Washington and begin the process of saving the future for our children.

As part of this agreement Members will see us provide permanent tax relief for American families. Our \$500-per-child tax credit, capital gains tax cuts for all Americans, and in my district for farmers and small business people, this will be a huge benefit to them.

Members also see us work in this agreement to save Medicare. Medicare, as we all know, is going broke. It is an important program for our senior citizens. We need to protect and preserve Medicare. That will be part of this agreement. It will not solve the problem long term, but it will provide 10 years of solvency to the Medicare trust fund.

Is there a lot more to do? You bet. But I have to tell the Members, as one who has been here for just 6 years, this is another giant step for this Congress. The real winners in this agreement are not Republicans and not Democrats, but the American people and our children and their children who will benefit because they will have the shot at the American dream that today is in jeopardy for them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rule does provide for a reasonable amount of debate, but it is a flawed process. In the first place, it is simply wrong for us to be debating on such short notice such a comprehensive piece of legislation. There simply has not been time, and no one can begin to argue that there has been, since the deal was cut last week, for there to be any thorough airing of this.

This process disrespects democracy, Mr. Speaker. People talk about the American people, but apparently do not have enough confidence in them, Mr. Speaker, to let them make the decisions through the normal democratic process.

I reject the notion that the democratic process has broken down. Through the normal democratic process in the 1993 budget agreement that I voted for, as did many on this side, we have brought the deficit down. We have brought the deficit down unusually, unlike during the Reagan years, at a time when we are stimulating the economy.

Indeed, the Federal Reserve is in a meeting now, and I do not know whether they decided to try and slow it down again, I hope not, but the economy in fact we are told by the Federal Reserve is growing too quickly. We are beginning to make progress. That does not mean we can rest on our laurels. It does mean that there is no argument for short-circuiting democracy, for having a comprehensive budget deal, arrived at in private meetings, voted on within a couple of days, and to preempt decisions that the voters ought to make.

How can we decide today what the breakdown between military and non-military spending ought to be 3 and 4 years from now? How can we today de-

cide that we are going to put limits on health research, limits on community development? How do we make those decisions today, and why? What is the matter with letting democracy function? Why should we not allow, in the 1998 and 2000 elections, this country decide?

We should be getting the deficit to zero. We are making progress, and indeed, we will have made more progress in terms of reducing the deficit in dollar terms over the last couple of years without this deal than we are going to make in the next couple of years with this deal.

The first impact of this deal will be to slow down the progress. Instead, we ought to slow down the deal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget is that one piece of legislation where we really set forth priorities for America. We decide what is important to us, what our values are, and in effect, we put a price tag on them. In the Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall substitute provided for in this rule later tonight, Members will have an opportunity to make a choice for the future of America. We will offer Members the opportunity on behalf of all Americans to make an investment in America's transportation needs in \$1 trillion of our \$6 trillion national economy, which is what transportation accounts for.

What we will do in this substitute is equally cut across-the-board, one-third of 1 percent over 5 years reduction in domestic discretionary, defense discretionary spending, and the tax reduction will be one-third of 1 percent less than proposed, in order to put back into transportation the tax dollars we pay at the gas pump.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing this afternoon and this evening with one of the more dramatic and far-reaching budget resolutions that has been considered in Congress in recent memory. We have a bipartisan resolution that is designed and calculated to use Congressional Budget Office forecasting and eliminate this deficit by the year 2002.

At the same time, we are dramatically reducing taxes and we are expanding programs. I think for many of us this seems too good to be true. Some of us are pinching ourselves and saying, is it possible that it cannot be true? How can we ensure that we achieve the results that we expect?

Several, in fact, over 60 in this body signed a letter that went to the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget saying that we need to have enforcement language in the budget resolution, representing the sense of Congress, as to what our

goals are, and we were not able to get that language into the resolution in the committee.

We were told in the committee that we would have an opportunity to present that in a substitute budget on the floor. Unfortunately, the rule does not allow that substitute to be considered. For this reason, I must rise and strongly, strongly oppose the rule that is before us this afternoon, and say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, a bipartisan effort to include significant strong enforcement language has been undermined by the machinations of staff or someone in this institution.

I think it is deeply regrettable that this bipartisan undertaking, which would have been historic, will not be allowed to proceed, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against the previous question and against the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of the rule and the resolution of the Committee on the Budget. After years of deficit spending, we can begin laying the groundwork today for an honest balanced budget, while at the same time providing permanent tax relief, reforming Medicare, achieving significant entitlement savings, investing in domestic priorities, and making sure that the Government lives within its means.

Unlike the budgets of the past, this resolution is based on steadily declining deficits every year until 2002, when we can expect a budget surplus. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, a surplus is actually within reach. I know it is hard to believe, especially when we consider that the Federal Government has not balanced the budget in nearly a generation.

That is simply a crime, Mr. Speaker, a crime against our children and our grandchildren who deserve a sound financial future. We have to stop robbing them of the opportunities and prosperity that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an advocate for victims of crime almost my entire professional life. I think it is time to consider another kind of victims' rights, the right of future generations who will be crippled by higher taxes and a crushing debt unless we commit ourselves today to a balanced budget.

Getting to where we are has not been easy. The political rhetoric and demagoguing has been almost overwhelming at times. But we listened to the American people and we persevered. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN KASICH, for his years and years of hard work, for his commitment to the good of the country, and for his determination in working to make this a bipartisan agreement.

Nobody would say that this is perfect. All of us could improve upon it.

However, it gives us so much. So, to paraphrase an old friend of all of ours, Bob Michel, let us not kill this good product with 1,000 points of spite. Let us not let the perfect become the enemy of the good.

Under the terms of this fair and balanced rule we will debate a variety of budget proposals, each reflecting its own goals and spending priorities. The different sponsors deserve credit for their hard work, but let me caution the Members, under this rule there are no free votes. There is no room for political cover. Every vote counts, because whichever measure passes here will be the one we must all live with. Let us not undermine the hard work of the House and the Senate and the administration, the weeks of negotiation that have produced this very delicate win-win agreement. The country deserves no less.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this responsible rule. They should make their vote count today and support the fine work of the Committee on the Budget. Let us give the next generation of Americans the kind of future they deserve.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Speaker, I gather that the various factions on the other side of the aisle have now come to a resolution and have decided that the Minge amendment will not be made in order under this rule. So we are now proceeding to the consideration of the rule as originally presented to this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I share the commitment of many here today to achieve a balanced budget, but it is not just enough to balance the budget for a nanosecond. It is a question of whether or not we have a plan that will balance the budget and keep it balanced.

Over the last few weeks, and certainly I know that will be true throughout the rest of today, there is a lot of backslapping. There is a debate about who is the greatest statesman for putting this agreement together. A lot of popping of champagne corks; I believe I am going to hold my champagne until the budget is actually in balance, because there is nothing very new about people promising to balance the budget.

And as my colleague from Texas just pointed out, one of the problems that we have here today with what has essentially been a budget agreement where until the last few days we did not have any of the blanks filled in and it was based on the theme song from the Caribbean, do not worry, be happy, about this budget, I am happy about having a balanced budget agreement. But I am a little worried about whether the promise of that balanced budget is ever going to be achieved.

The best way to achieve it is not in listening to one person extol the great

virtues of another but in having a meaningful enforcement mechanism. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] just pointed out is that today the Republicans have rejected any kind of effective enforcement mechanism. One was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the so-called blue dog Democrats. Another was offered by myself. It is very simple, one paragraph, a sunset provision, using the sunset approach that we have implemented in Texas to say, we will limit the authorization for any of this new entitlement spending that President Clinton wanted and we will limit the tax reductions that the Republicans and President Clinton wanted also to a 5-year period.

If we are balancing the budget, if we are getting the deficit under control, there will be nothing easier than for this Congress to reauthorize them. But to move forward with this budget resolution without an effective enforcement mechanism does not ensure the American people a true balanced budget. It only ensures more talk of a balanced budget that may or may not achieve the eventual objective. This sunset provision was described by Republicans in the committee as prudent, as reasonable, and it ought to be adopted today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to briefly respond.

The gentleman states that Members that are supporting this historic document before us which does balance the budget are somehow extolling our own personal virtues. I do not think it is we that are extolling our own personal virtues. I think it is the American people, because the American people spoke very strongly in wanting this Congress to get along with each other and wanting this Congress to get along with the President.

I have to commend the President for sitting down and working, I think sincerely, in trying to bring an agreement to this floor. Certainly it is not what I like. It is not what the left wing likes. But it is an agreement. It is probably the only agreement that we could ever reach because we had to bring both ends together in middle and that is always very difficult. That is why we ought to be supporting this agreement here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is going to talk about something that is near and dear to my heart and to the heart of the American people who have worked hard all their lives to save and invest their money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. KINGSTON]. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had 13 minutes remaining, before yielding to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Glens Falls for yielding me the time and for his kind remarks about a very important part of this budget package. I believe that in large part, due to the efforts of Democrats and Republicans in this House who cosponsored H.R. 14, which we introduced on the opening day of the 105th Congress, to take the top rate on capital gains from 28-to-14 percent, due to the fact that we have bipartisan support, I believe we have been able to successfully get President Clinton in this agreement to come on board finally in support of a broad-based, across-the-board reduction in capital gains. We are hoping very much that we will be able to see it at 14 percent. I am happy that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is trying to pursue that direction of reducing that top rate as low as we can get it. Many of us believe that the top rate on capital gains should be zero, there should be no tax on it whatsoever.

This is the single most important part of this tax package. Why? Because the argument that we have so often heard in the past, that a capital gains tax rate reduction is nothing but a tax cut for the rich, is totally false. I am happy to say that Democrats are finally joining Republicans in recognizing that. Why is that no longer the case? Well, we have done a study that shows that, if we had around a 14-or-15 percent top tax on capital gains taxes, we would in fact increase the average take-home pay for the working, average working family by \$1,500 per year.

We also know that, of the 90 million-some-odd families in this country, as my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], who is a cosponsor of H.R. 14, has said repeatedly, 63 million own mutual funds. So we have many people who have investments. We have literally \$8 trillion that is locked in today, \$8 trillion that is locked in because that tax is so high. What we need to also look at is the fact that 40 percent of those realized gains are held by people with incomes of less than \$50,000 a year.

Our goal with this budget is of course to balance the budget. There is no better way to boost the flow of revenues to the Treasury than to cut the top rate on capital gains. In fact, we found in our study that over a 7-year period we could boost revenues by \$211 billion. There is a lot of talk about that so-called windfall that came from the CBO letter with that \$125 billion that came in. Quite frankly, reducing the top rate on capital would spur economic growth. It is great that we are pushing at well over 5 percent now. But these assumptions are based on a 2.1-percent growth rate. If we reduce the top rate on capital significantly, we can see a growth rate that is even stronger than that.

While we hear about uncertainty in the future economically, this cut in the

capital gains tax rate could in fact play a role in ensuring that we do not go into economic recession. So I rise in strong support of the rule and in support of this package. Then we are going to work hard in a bipartisan way to cut the tax on capital gains.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question. I will include for the RECORD the amendment I would offer to the rule if the previous question is defeated.

The amendment would make in order two additional amendments to the budget agreement, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT]. Both these amendments are attempts to ensure that a balanced budget plan actually achieves balance. The Minge substitute includes enforcement provisions to force the Congress to stay on course over the next 5 years. The Doggett amendment precludes enactment of tax cuts before the budget is actually in balance. The House should be given the opportunity to vote on these amendments. If we defeat the previous question, the House will ensure that we will have full and fair debate on the balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question.

I include for the RECORD the amendment I would offer to the rule if the previous question is defeated. The amendment would make in order two additional amendments to the budget agreement by Representatives MINGE and DOGGETT. Both these amendments are attempts to ensure that a balanced budget plan actually achieves balance. The Minge substitute includes enforcement provisions to force the Congress to stay on course over the next 5 years. The Doggett amendment precludes enactment of tax cuts before the budget is actually in balance. The House should be given the opportunity to vote on these amendments. If we defeat the previous question, the House will ensure that we will have full and fair debate on the balanced budget.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 152

On page 2, line 21, after "XXIII" strike ":", and insert ":", and the amendments designated in section 4 of this resolution."

On page 3, line 2, after "2" insert "and section 4".

On page 4, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments:

(1) an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered by Representative Minge.

(2) an amendment to be offered by Representative Doggett.

MINGE AMENDMENT No. 1

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,198,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,241,859,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,285,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,343,591,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$7,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$11,083,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: -\$21,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: -\$22,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: -\$19,871,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,385,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,440,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,486,314,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,520,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,551,837,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,371,887,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,424,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,468,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,500,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,516,298,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$172,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$182,372,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$183,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$157,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$108,734,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,592,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,834,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,081,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,298,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,474,400,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$33,829,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$33,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$34,775,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$36,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$315,472,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$324,749,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$328,124,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$332,063,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$268,197,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$265,978,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$588,000,000.

- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,784,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$265,771,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$757,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$274,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,418,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,050,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,305,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,110,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,050,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,092,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,571,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$1,050,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,909,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,558,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,966,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$12,751,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,569,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,021,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,093,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,981,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,077,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,434,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,114,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,751,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,122,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$13,826,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,812,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,178,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$14,217,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,882,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,203,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,528,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,013,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,862,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,604,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,668,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,247,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,446,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,293,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,939,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,048,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,867,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,171,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,877,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,405,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,227,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,702,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$32,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,570,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,963,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$32,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,720,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$34,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,086,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,313,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$34,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,133,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,892,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,620,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,365,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,294,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,047,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,436,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,215,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,664,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,071,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,509,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,978,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,494,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,960,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,583,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,670,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,108,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,965,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$6,660,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$920,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$245,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,299,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,887,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$253,450,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,821,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,238,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$255,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,078,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,133,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,574,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$257,989,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,678,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,541,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,680,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$259,897,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,574,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,933,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$155,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,256,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$135,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,114,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,357,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,135,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,303,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,184,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,247,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,768,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,387,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,867,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,385,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,902,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,943,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,810,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,986,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,020,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,764,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,350,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,098,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,790,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,429,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,180,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$2,475,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,020,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$56,062,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,328,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$20,665,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,450,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$59,335,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,092,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$21,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,703,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,728,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,926,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$23,263,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,959,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,931,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$14,701,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$24,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,339,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,316,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,426,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,676,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$137,836,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$137,804,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$85,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$144,939,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$144,915,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$154,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$153,898,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$163,413,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$163,136,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$172,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$171,692,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$201,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$201,764,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$212,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$211,548,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$225,540,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$225,537,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$239,636,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$238,781,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$251,548,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$250,769,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$239,032,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$247,758,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$45,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$254,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$258,064,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$75,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$269,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$268,161,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$110,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$275,145,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$277,264,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$145,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$286,945,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$285,239,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$170,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$37,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,524,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,196,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,792,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,866,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,022,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,043,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,383,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,398,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,545,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,337,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,029,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$27,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,715,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,949,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,068,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,671,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,168,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,177,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$26,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,486,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,249,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,565,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,719,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,277,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$25,129,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,765,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,609,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,120,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,976,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,240,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,354,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,901,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,883,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,879,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,711,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,959,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,444,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,363,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,977,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,727,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,675,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,131,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,105,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$296,549,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$296,549,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$304,567,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$304,567,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$304,867,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$304,867,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$303,659,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,659,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$303,754,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,754,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, -\$41,841,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$41,841,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, -\$36,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$36,949,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, -\$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, -\$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, -\$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments \$0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: -\$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, -\$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and -\$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: \$214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, \$621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and \$1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,172,136,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, \$1,382,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and \$7,493,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the

total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: —\$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, —\$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and —\$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: \$214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, \$621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,164,736,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, \$1,362,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and \$7,408,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "direct spending" has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than \$2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than \$3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than \$16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of \$25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, \$25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and \$127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term "direct spending" has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "highway trust fund" refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

- (1) 69-8083-0-7-401 (Federal-Aid Highways).
- (2) 69-8191-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).
- (3) 69-8350-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).
- (4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).
- (5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).
- (6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce

and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) \$200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) \$200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) \$1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing up to \$165 million in outlays for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges for fiscal year 1998 (assuming \$700 million in outlays over 5 fiscal years), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate sub-allocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that reconciliation legislation considered pursuant to this legislation must include enforcement procedures to ensure that the Budget of the United States Government does reach balance by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter. Such language should—

(1) set nominal targets for spending, revenues, and deficits for each year of the next 10 years;

(2) require that the President propose a budget that complies with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or propose to change the targets, and require that any budget resolution considered by the House of Representatives and the Senate comply with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or recommend changes to those targets;

(3) include all portions of the budget and apply such enforcement proportionally to the specific parts of the budget that caused the deficit to exceed the target in any year. This should be accomplished through a combination of—

(A) extension of the caps for discretionary spending enforced by sequestration through fiscal year 2002;

(B) global caps for total entitlement spending and specific caps within the global caps for large entitlement programs, with sequestration applied to those programs or categories that caused outlays to exceed the caps;

(C) a requirement that tax cuts be phased in contingent on meeting the revenue targets in the agreement;

(4) allow adjustments to spending caps and revenue and deficit targets for changes in actual economic conditions to avoid forcing policy changes due directly and exclusively to changes in economic conditions;

(5) prevent the use of emergencies to evade the enforcement mechanism by establishing procedures to budget for and control emergency spending; and

(6) if the actual deficit is below the target in any year, lock in such budget savings for deficit and debt reduction.

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 84 OFFERED BY
MESSRS. DOGGETT AND WEYGAND

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

SEC. . PROTECTION OF BALANCED BUDGET.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to assure that neither the tax cuts nor the spending increases in this resolution explode in cost, endangering the balanced budget promised by 2002 or the ability to maintain balance thereafter, any provision of law affecting revenues or authorizing spending for new entitlement initiatives assumed in this resolution should sunset and cease to be effective within five years, unless subsequently reauthorized by law.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The amendment addresses the possibility that exploding tax cuts and new spending in the agreement could jeopardize the balanced budget by stating the "sense of Congress" that any tax-law changes and new entitlement spending enacted pursuant to the agreement should sunset and cease to be effective for only five years, unless subsequently reauthorized by Congress.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To

defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is the one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

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

We all should continue to be concerned about the debt of the Federal Government. We continue to increase the debt subject to the debt limit, and

I would just remind Members that in 1979, when we started the so-called rule 49, the Gephardt rule, that says we are automatically going to increase the debt when we pass the budget resolution, at that time we had a debt of \$829 billion, which was 33 percent of GDP, of gross domestic product. Today the debt is \$5.2 trillion, almost 70 percent of GDP.

When we brag about being the shining knight on the white horse that is bringing the deficit down, I would just like to call to the attention of my colleagues what has really brought the deficit down. We had huge tax increases in 1990 and again in 1993, but an economic system that surged ahead. Our free enterprise capitalistic system continued to expand revenues while spending continued to increase faster than inflation. But in the process, the deficit has gone down.

This budget proposal, I would have written to have tax decreases that spur economic growth and job creation more than we do in this proposal. But I thank the committee for including in this proposal the waiving of rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule, so that we can have an up or down vote on the debt limit that is so important to our economic future.

I thank the Rules Committee for supporting my House Resolution 30 at least temporarily dispensing with rule 49 in this rule. Now House rule 49 will not apply to the spending in this budget resolution.

House rule 49, the so-called Gephardt rule was passed in 1979 in order to allow Members to avoid a separate embarrassing vote to raise the debt ceiling.

During the debate, those in favor of the Gephardt rule argued that spending determined the need for borrowing and therefore a separate vote was not needed.

Opponents, however, argued that a separate vote on the debt ceiling was still needed because it was the only time the House took to reflect on the increasing national debt and its impact on future generations.

Since the imposition of the Gephardt rule, the debt has increased. The arguments against the rule are stronger than ever because of the increasing national debt.

Fiscal year	Gross Federal debt	Debt as percentage of GDP
1979	\$829.47 billion	33.2 percent
1996	5.182 trillion	69.2 percent

The Gephardt rule treats Congress' constitutional power to borrow as intermixed with its power to spend. This violates the spirit of the constitution which lists these powers as separate and distinct. As a result of the Gephardt rule, Federal borrowing is no longer seen as an emergency power for times of depression or war, but just another, natural part of the Federal budget process.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I also want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his persistence and commitment to a balanced budget. I think I can say that he is one of the true taxpayer heroes in this body, and we would not be

here today if it had not been for his valiant efforts and some of his earlier authorship of some very important budget work, which I was pleased to join with.

Two and a half years ago at the start of the 104th Congress, a new majority went to work to balance the budget and provide real tax relief for the American people. Our new majority pledged to save the Medicare Program, rein in out-of-control spending and, in a nutshell, bring fiscal sanity back to our Nation.

The naysayers scoffed and the big government liberals said, you cannot do that. They laughed in derision, they called it a radical idea that could not be done without starving the children and slashing Social Security. Our President not only refused to endorse the balanced budget, he repudiated it through his own budget request. Despite this hostile opposition, we remained steadfast in our commitment and pushed forward to get the job done.

What a difference a few years makes. This budget resolution locks in the President and the Congress to a real balanced budget in 5 years. Like most compromises, it is not perfect. As a member of the Kerrey commission, I am concerned that we rely on reductions to health care providers, rather than expanding choice and competition, and going after the cost drivers in our effort to save Medicare.

I am also anxious about the lack of eliminations in the discretionary portion of the budget. We cannot be satisfied with trimming back on wasteful spending here and there. We must insist on ripping out bad programs by the roots. I intend to continue my efforts to eliminate these wasteful programs as they are identified during the appropriations process. In the past few years I have offered a list of specifics cutting hundreds of billions, and I will do so again this year.

But I have always felt that we cannot afford to make the perfect the enemy of the good. And for those who would still say that we have not made significant progress, I would encourage them to leaf through this document, the fiscal year 1996 budget of the United States Government. This is the President's budget request for 1996, just 2 years ago. The President's vision then, \$200 billion a year deficits as far as the eye could see into the future. That is the best they could do.

Now, let us move fast forward to today's budget resolution. Not only have we agreed to a balanced budget, we have provided overdue relief for millions of American taxpayers. We have offered another vision for America, one where we pay our own bills, we live within our means and we reduce the tax burden on our producers. Now, thankfully, the President has joined us and endorsed that vision.

I urge support for this fair and appropriate rule and for the balanced budget amendment. America is ready and waiting. This is good news.

□ 1500

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and since the gentleman from Texas has yielded back all of his time, I will be extremely brief.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat taken by some of the statements from the other side of the aisle in opposing this vital piece of legislation that is on the floor today. As I said earlier, this agreement, this budget agreement, this historic budget agreement, is going to save \$600 billion. That is not \$600 million, Mr. Speaker, that is \$600 billion over the next 5 years.

There is going to be discretionary spending cuts in various programs that is going to be substantial; and, in addition to that, there is going to be meaningful tax cuts, especially a capital gains tax cut, that will benefit people like a couple I know that have worked all their lives for Sears Roebuck.

They work at a nominal salary, Sears Roebuck does not pay huge salaries, but these people have stock options. They have saved their money and saved their stock all of these years, for 35 years, and now their total equity is tied up in this stock and all of the increased value that stock has today. Those people should be able to sell that stock and they should be able to do it without giving the Government half of the money.

That is why we are going to reduce the tax rate on capital gains in this country. We are going to reduce the estate tax for people that have worked all their lives, that have saved for their children and, now, if they are going to pass on, they ought to be able to give that estate to their children without the Government taking half of that money. I mean what is America all about, if it is not to reward those of us that have worked hard all of our lives?

That is what this debate is all about here today. So I will ask all my colleagues to come over here and vote for the previous question, vote for the rule, and then vote for this agreement, which is a good agreement for the American people and American families in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

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

will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

Without objection, each of the postponed votes on the motions to suspend the rules will be 5-minute votes immediately after disposition of this rule.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 200, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No 140]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gilman	Parker
Archer	Goodlatte	Paul
Armey	Goodling	Paxon
Bachus	Goss	Pease
Baker	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Granger	Petri
Barr	Greenwood	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bartlett	Hall (OH)	Pombo
Bass	Hansen	Porter
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Bereuter	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hefley	Quinn
Bliley	Herger	Radanovich
Blunt	Hilleary	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hobson	Redmond
Boehner	Hoekstra	Regula
Bonilla	Horn	Riggs
Bono	Hostettler	Riley
Brady	Houghton	Rogan
Bryant	Hulshof	Rogers
Bunning	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hyde	Roukema
Buyer	Inglis	Royce
Callahan	Istook	Ryun
Calvert	Jenkins	Salmon
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Sanford
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Cannon	Jones	Scarborough
Castle	Kasich	Schaefer, Dan
Chabot	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Kim	Sessions
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shadeegg
Christensen	Kingston	Shaw
Coble	Klug	Shays
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Collins	Kolbe	Shuster
Combest	LaHood	Skeen
Cook	Largent	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cox	LaTourette	Smith (OR)
Crane	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Leach	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Linder	Souder
Deal	Livingston	Spence
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stump
Dickey	Manzullo	Sununu
Doolittle	McCollum	Talent
Dreier	McCrery	Tauzin
Duncan	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	McHugh	Thomas
Ehlers	McInnis	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Thune
Emerson	McKeon	Tiahrt
English	Metcalf	Traficant
Ensign	Mica	Upton
Everett	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Ewing	Molinar	Wamp
Fawell	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Foley	Morella	Watts (OK)
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fox	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Whitfield
Galleghy	Northup	Wicker
Ganske	Norwood	Wolf
Gekas	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Packard	
Gillmor	Pappas	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Barton	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Bonior
Andrews	Bentsen	Borski
Baessler	Berman	Boswell
Baldacci	Berry	Boucher
Barcia	Bishop	Boyd
Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich	Brown (CA)

Brown (OH)	Hooley	Pallone
Campbell	Hoyer	Pascrell
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Carson	(TX)	Pelosi
Clay	John	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Johnson (WI)	Pickett
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Poshard
Condit	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Costello	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Coyne	Kennelly	Reyes
Cramer	Kildee	Rivers
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Danner	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Davis (FL)	Klecza	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Klink	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rush
DeGette	LaFalce	Sabo
Delahunt	Lampson	Sanchez
DeLauro	Lantos	Sandlin
Dellums	Levin	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Schaffer, Bob
Dicks	Lipinski	Scott
Dingell	Lofgren	Serrano
Dixon	Lowe	Sherman
Doggett	Luther	Sisisky
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Skaggs
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Edwards	Manton	Slaughter
Engel	Markey	Smith, Adam
Eshoo	Martinez	Snyder
Etheridge	Mascara	Spratt
Evans	Matsui	Stabenow
Farr	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Fazio	McDermott	Stokes
Filner	McGovern	Strickland
Flake	McHale	Stupak
Foglietta	McIntyre	Tanner
Ford	McKinney	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Frost	Meehan	Thompson
Furse	Meek	Thurman
Gedensson	Menendez	Tierney
Gephardt	Millender	Torres
Gonzalez	McDonald	Towns
Goode	Miller (CA)	Turner
Gordon	Minge	Velazquez
Green	Mink	Vento
Gutierrez	Moakley	Visclosky
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Waters
Hamilton	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Harman	Nadler	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Weygand
Hefner	Oberstar	Wise
Hill	Obey	Wynn
Hilliard	Olver	Yates
Hinojosa	Ortiz	
Holden	Owens	

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman	Hinchey	Schumer
Bilbray	Jefferson	Waxman
Brown (FL)	Moran (VA)	White
Fowler	Sanders	Woolsey
Hastert	Schiff	

□ 1524

Ms. ESHOO, and Messrs. SHERMAN, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MOAKLEY, and SPRATT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 142, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—278

Abercrombie Gonzalez Packard
Aderholt Goodlatte Pallone
Andrews Goodling Pappas
Archer Goss Parker
Armey Graham Pascarell
Bachus Granger Pastor
Baker Greenwood Paul
Baldacci Gutierrez Paxon
Ballenger Gutknecht Pease
Barcia Hall (OH) Peterson (PA)
Barr Hamilton Petri
Barrett (NE) Hansen Pickering
Bartlett Hastings (WA) Pitts
Bass Hayworth Pombo
Bateman Hefley Pomeroy
Bentsen Hefner Porter
Bereuter Herger Portman
Bilirakis Hilleary Pryce (OH)
Bliley Hobson Quinn
Blunt Hoekstra Radanovich
Boehlert Holden Rahall
Boehner Hoolley Ramstad
Bonilla Horn Redmond
Bono Hostettler Regula
Borski Houghton Riley
Boswell Hoyer Rodriguez
Brady Hulshof Roemer
Bryant Hunter Rogan
Bunning Hutchinson Rogers
Burr Hyde Rohrabacher
Burton Inglis Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer Johnson (CT) Rothman
Callahan Johnson, Sam Roukema
Calvert Jones Royce
Camp Kasich Ryun
Canady Kelly Sabo
Cannon Kennedy (MA) Salmon
Capps Kennelly Sanford
Cardin Kim Saxton
Castle Kim Scarborough
Chabot King (NY) Schaefer, Dan
Chambliss Kingston Schaffer, Bob
Chenoweth Kleczka Sensenbrenner
Christensen Klug Serrano
Clement Knollenberg Sessions
Clyburn Kolbe Shadegg
Coble LaHood Shaw
Collins Lampson Shays
Combest Largent Sherman
Cook Latham Shimkus
Cooksey LaTourette Shuster
Cox Lazio Skeen
Crane Leach Smith (MI)
Crapo Levin Smith (NJ)
Cubin Lewis (CA) Smith (OR)
Cunningham Lewis (KY) Smith (TX)
Davis (VA) Linder Smith, Adam
Deal Livingston Smith, Linda
DeLay LoBiondo Snowbarger
Dellums Lucas Snyder
Diaz-Balart Manzullo Solomon
Dickey Spence Souder
Dicks Mascara Spratt
Dixon McCollum Stokes
Doolittle McCrery Strickland
Doyle McDade Stump
Dreier McGovern Sununu
Duncan McHugh Talent
Dunn McInnis Tauzin
Ehlers McIntosh Taylor (NC)
Ehrlich McKeon Thomas
Emerson Menendez Thornberry
English Metcalf Thune
Ensign Mica Tiahrt
Eshoo Millender Traficant
Etheridge McDonald Upton
Everett Miller (FL) Vento
Ewing Mink Walsh
Fawell Moakley Watkins
Foley Molinari Watts (OK)
Forbes Mollohan Weldon (FL)
Fox Moran (KS) Weldon (PA)
Franks (NJ) Moran (VA) Weller
Frelinghuysen Morella Weygand
Frost Murtha Whitfield
Gallegly Myrick Wicker
Ganske Nethercutt Wise
Gejdenson Neumann Wolf
Gekas Ney Wynn
Gibbons Northup Young (AK)
Gilchrest Norwood Young (FL)
Gillmor Oberstar
Gilman Ortiz
Oxley

NAYS—142

Allen Gephardt Nadler
Baesler Goode Neal
Gordon Nussle
Green Obey
Hall (TX) Oliver
Harman Owens
Hastings (FL) Payne
Hill Pelosi
Hilliard Peterson (MN)
Hinojosa Pickett
Istook Poshard
Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
Jackson-Lee Rangel
(TX) Reyes
John Riggs
Johnson (WI) Rivers
Johnson, E.B. Roybal-Allard
Kanjorski Rush
Kaptur Sanchez
Kennedy (RI) Sandlin
Kildee Sawyer
Kilpatrick Schumer
Kind (WI) Scott
Klink Sisisky
Kucinich Skaggs
LaFalce Skelton
Lantos Slaughter
Lewis (GA) Stabenow
Lipinski Stark
Lofgren Stearns
Lowey Stenholm
Luther Stupak
Maloney (CT) Tanner
Maloney (NY) Tauscher
Manton Taylor (MS)
Markley Thompson
Martinez Thurman
Engel Tierney
Evans Torres
McCarthy (MO) Torres
McDermott Towns
McHale Turner
McIntyre Velazquez
McKinney Visclosky
McNulty Wamp
Meehan Watt (NC)
Meek Wexler
Miller (CA) Yates
Minge

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman Hastert Schiff
Bilbray Hinchey Waxman
Brown (FL) Jefferson White
Coburn Jenkins Woolsey
Fowler Sanders

□ 1533

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1122. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 711(b)(2) of Public Law 104-293, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, appoints the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] as a member of the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1650, by the yeas and nays; and House Resolution 147, by the yeas and nays.

Under the previous order of today, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each vote by electronic device in this series.

PERMITTING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR CONGRESSIONAL CEREMONY HONORING MOTHER TERESA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie Brady Crane
Aderholt Brown (CA) Crapo
Allen Brown (OH) Cubin
Andrews Bryant Cummings
Archer Bunning Cunningham
Armey Burr Danner
Bachus Buyer Davis (FL)
Baesler Callahan Davis (IL)
Baldacci Calvert Davis (VA)
Camp Deal
Ballenger Campbell DeFazio
Barcia Canady DeGette
Barrett (NE) Cannon Delahunt
Barrett (WI) Capps DeLauro
Bartlett Cardin DeLay
Bass Carson Dellums
Bateman Castle Deutsch
Becerra Chabot Diaz-Balart
Bentsen Chambliss Dickey
Bereuter Chenoweth Dicks
Berman Christensen Dingell
Berry Clay Dixon
Bilirakis Clayton Doggett
Bishop Clement Dooley
Blagojevich Clyburn Doolittle
Bliley Coble Doyle
Blumenauer Coburn Dreier
Blunt Collins Duncan
Boehlert Combest Dunn
Boehner Condit Edwards
Bonilla Conyers Ehlers
Bonior Cook Ehrlich
Bono Cooksey Emerson
Borski Costello Engel
Boswell Cox English
Boucher Coyne Ensign
Boyd Cramer Eshoo