

not want to object to the gentleman's request, but I would request that we be given a little time to examine it. It is new to me. I would like to check it out. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his unanimous consent and let me have a couple of hours here to check it and renew it at a later point?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. This vote is going to be coming up early this afternoon, after 1:30. The objection last night was that this would somehow affect NGO's. We actually have talked to NGO's that are going into Sudan. They have said this would not have any impact on them whatsoever. But we wanted to just bend over backwards to make sure that everybody knew that humanitarian assistance was cleared.

Let me just say that after this passes, we will certainly be glad as we go to conference to do whatever it takes to make sure that the minority has no concerns regarding it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I do not have any doubt about the gentleman's intent here, but since I have only had a very few minutes to look at it, I still feel like I need some additional time to review it, so I would be constrained to object to the unanimous consent at this point. However, I would anticipate we could work this out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman agree to possibly, if I come back to amend it before the vote, when we come back in later today, would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. I understand there is a vote pending on the gentleman's amendment. I do not want to delay that. Let us proceed quickly here to find out about it. Then the gentleman can renew his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will be back in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON 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 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

### H. RES. 160

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose 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 may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the customary rule for considering a conference report on a budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, and against its consideration.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This 1 hour is instead of

the 5 hours called for under section 305(a) of the Budget Act. However, a review of the budget conference report rules over the last decade or so reveals that most of them provided for only 1 hour of debate, so this is customary, what we are doing here today.

Finally, the rule does not address the issue of a motion to recommit, since section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act states that a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order under the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a customary rule for the consideration of a budget resolution conference report.

Turning to the conference report itself, it is extremely important to recognize that this is a dramatic and a very positive shift in the direction of this country. This improvement 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 the Committee on the Budget. They and the other Members who worked with them deserve our commendation.

Our former colleague and leader, Bob Michel, used to say on this floor that "in political decision-making, we must never let the perfect become the enemy of the good." This sage advice I think applies here today.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget agreement is not perfect and it does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member of this House. In fact, I think that I can say with certainty that every Member of the House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making that decision.

I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had deeper spending cuts, much deeper. I would have had more tax cuts, more entitlement reform to get these entitlements under control, and certainly more spending for defense, which is really why this Congress exists, is to provide for a common defense for the 50 States against those that would take away our freedoms.

However, it is important to recognize once again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and in process. This principled 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. That is what this budget is all about.

Second, on balance it is a good budget. It is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts. These are specific changes that are being written into the law by the adoption of this budget, something radically different than the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and my colleagues all know that that did not work at all.

This one is going to work. These principles deliver real benefits for the American people. Listen to these facts.

First, this agreement balances the budget for the first time in 30 years, and for the second time in 40 years. Government spending will be less than 20 percent of the gross domestic product for the first time since 1974. Think about that. American taxpayers will save \$600 billion over the next 5 years in entitlement spending reform, the fastest growing portion of the budget. Finally, this Congress has got the guts to stand up here and do something about it.

Most importantly of all, Mr. Speaker, nondefense discretionary spending will grow at one-half of 1 percent a year over the next 5 years, one-half of 1 percent per year over the next 5 years compared with 6 percent per year over the last 5 years. What a difference that is going to make.

Contrary to what some have asserted, this budget is also built on conservative economic 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 alone. The unemployment rate has remained below 5 percent, I think it is 4.9 percent right now, and the CPI may actually be going down. This budget is built on sound economic assumptions as well as a strong and vibrant national economy.

Furthermore, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, has stated, and again this is very important, that balancing the budget will further improve the performance of the economy.

Why is that so? One-third of all the interest that the American people pay on their home mortgages, one-third of it, let us say that their total mortgage interest rate per year is \$6,000, \$2,000 of that is caused by the Federal deficits. If we get these deficits under control, we are putting \$2,000 back into the pockets of families with mortgages. That is nontaxable money. That is money they have already paid taxes on, so that they can go out and spend it or save it, and either way it certainly stimulates the economy.

While this conference report is good, the reconciliation and appropriation bills that follow it are perhaps the most important bills that we will pass in this Congress this year, important in the sense that they will also directly benefit every single American family.

I think we owe it to those families to pass this budget and then once that is done, Mr. Speaker, to summon the courage to vote "yes" on these enabling authorization and appropriation measures that will cut spending, that will cut taxes, and end the deficits that are bankrupting the future generations of Americans. I, for one, pledge here today, right now, that I will vote for

every one of those spending cuts that are going to bring some fiscal sanity back to this Federal Government.

This budget is a victory for America's children, and I believe something this Congress and even this President should be proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson in a letter to a friend back in 1816 gave the following charge: "To preserve people's independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

I urge my colleagues to follow Thomas Jefferson's instructions to preserve independence and to maximize liberty by supporting this rule and supporting this balanced budget here 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, on May 20 when the House considered the rule providing for the consideration of the budget resolution, I said that the vote on the resolution was but the beginning of what promises to be a difficult process. I also said that even if individual Members supported the framework of the agreement to balance the Federal budget, such a vote would not obligate any Member to support the separate pieces implementing that agreement that he or she might consider unfair or ill-conceived.

Mr. Speaker, even before this conference report has been adopted, we are seeing pieces of the implementing package which might indeed be considered unfair. Many Members supported the budget agreement because it promised to right a wrong that had been part of the welfare reform legislation enacted in the last Congress. I am referring, of course, to the removal of thousands of elderly disabled legal immigrants from the SSI program.

This House agreed during the consideration of the supplemental appropriation to provide funding to keep disabled elderly legal immigrants on the rolls until the Congress had an opportunity to revisit the issue and correct what is an unjustifiable inequity. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is now offering the House what can only be called a bait-and-switch deal.

This budget agreement came about as a result of long and difficult negotiations between the administration and the Republican leadership. Democrats in the House were subsequently assured that the agreement ensured that disabled elderly legal immigrants would be protected as part of those negotiations. Mr. Speaker, how is it, then, that the Republican majority is now proposing to fulfill perhaps only a part of that agreement?

□ 1245

The Committee on Ways and Means now has pending before it a proposal which will fulfill at least that part of the agreement that might save the Re-

publican majority a major public and political embarrassment. To avoid what would surely create a public furor the Republicans have agreed that they will not kick those elderly disabled illegal immigrants who currently receive SSI off the rolls. Thus the Republicans will ensure that they will not be blamed for kicking sick old people out of their nursing home beds and onto the streets.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is only half of the deal. What about the future? Mr. Speaker, I ask this question in the context that this is the same Republican majority who left Washington for a 10-day break without addressing the urgent necessity of providing money to the flood ravaged regions of the Dakotas and the Midwest. This is the same Republican majority that is now going to send a supplemental appropriation to the President knowing full well that he will veto it because of the extraneous political issues which are designed to save them future political embarrassment are attached to a bill that was supposed to help families begin to put their lives back to order. What next Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this rule providing for the consideration of this conference report, but I caution my colleagues to examine closely every bill that comes to the floor which will implement this budget agreement. Some parts may indeed be fair and equitable and deserve the support of all Members, but others, Mr. Speaker, deserve to be exposed for what they are, Republican proposals which will fill only part of an agreement and are not part of the agreement at all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we have debated this at length, and we have with us speakers that could speak, but I would just as soon expedite this, and if the gentleman is willing to yield back his time, I would do so right after he does.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Texas is always agreeable, and because of that I also yield back the balance of our time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this measure will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] at 1:30 p.m.

# WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 160) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 47, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Bliley	Carson
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Castle
Aderholt	Blunt	Chabot
Allen	Boehlert	Chambliss
Archer	Boehner	Chenoweth
Armey	Bonilla	Christensen
Bachus	Bono	Clayton
Baesler	Boswell	Clement
Baker	Boucher	Clyburn
Baldacci	Boyd	Coble
Ballenger	Brady	Coburn
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Collins
Barr	Brown (OH)	Combest
Barrett (NE)	Bryant	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Bunning	Cook
Bartlett	Burr	Cooksey
Bass	Burton	Costello
Bateman	Buyer	Cox
Bentsen	Callahan	Coyne
Bereuter	Calvert	Cramer
Berman	Camp	Crane
Berry	Campbell	Crapo
Bilbray	Canady	Cubin
Bilirakis	Cannon	Cummings
Bishop	Capps	Cunningham
Blagojevich	Cardin	Danner

Davis (FL)	John	Pryce (OH)
Davis (IL)	Johnson (WI)	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Radanovich
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
DeGette	Jones	Redmond
DeLaunt	Kaptur	Regula
DeLauro	Kasich	Reyes
DeLay	Kelly	Riggs
Deutsch	Kennelly	Riley
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Rivers
Dickey	Kim	Rodriguez
Dingell	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Dixon	King (NY)	Rogan
Doggett	Kingston	Rogers
Dooley	Klecza	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Klug	Rothman
Dreier	Knollenberg	Roukema
Duncan	Kolbe	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	LaFalce	Royce
Edwards	LaHood	Ryun
Ehlers	Largent	Sabo
Ehrlich	Latham	Salmon
Emerson	LaTourette	Sanchez
Engel	Lazio	Sandlin
English	Leach	Sanford
Ensign	Levin	Sawyer
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Evans	Linder	Schaefer, Dan
Everett	Livingston	Schaffer, Bob
Ewing	LoBiondo	Schumer
Fattah	Lofgren	Scott
Fawell	Lowey	Sensenbrenner
Fazio	Lucas	Serrano
Flake	Luther	Sessions
Foglietta	Maloney (CT)	Shadegg
Foley	Maloney (NY)	Shaw
Forbes	Manton	Shays
Ford	Manzullo	Sherman
Fowler	Mascara	Shimkus
Fox	Matsui	Shuster
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)	Sisisky
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Skaggs
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Skeen
Frost	McDade	Skelton
Furse	McGovern	Slaughter
Gallegly	McHale	Smith (MI)
Ganske	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gejdenson	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Gekas	McIntosh	Smith (TX)
Gephardt	McIntyre	Smith, Adam
Gibbons	McKeon	Smith, Linda
Gilchrest	McKinney	Snowbarger
Gillmor	Meehan	Snyder
Gilman	Menendez	Solomon
Gonzalez	Metcalfe	Spence
Goodlatte	Mica	Spratt
Goodling	Millender-McDonald	Stabenow
Gordon	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Goss	Minge	Stenholm
Graham	Moakley	Strickland
Granger	Molinari	Stump
Green	Mollohan	Stupak
Gutierrez	Moran (KS)	Sununu
Gutknecht	Moran (VA)	Talent
Hall (OH)	Morella	Tanner
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Tauscher
Hamilton	Myrick	Tauzin
Hansen	Neal	Taylor (MS)
Harman	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Hastert	Neumann	Thomas
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Thornberry
Hayworth	Northup	Thune
Hefley	Norwood	Thurman
Hefner	Nussle	Tiahrt
Herger	Ortiz	Towns
Hill	Oxley	Traficant
Hilleary	Packard	Upton
Hinchey	Pallone	Vento
Hinojosa	Pappas	Walsh
Hobson	Parker	Wamp
Hoekstra	Pascrell	Watkins
Holden	Pastor	Watts (OK)
Hooley	Paul	Waxman
Horn	Paxon	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Houghton	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hoyer	Peterson (PA)	Wexler
Hulshof	Petri	Weygand
Hunter	Pickett	White
Hutchinson	Pitts	Whitfield
Hyde	Pombo	Wicker
Inglis	Pomeroy	Wise
Jackson (IL)	Porter	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee	Portman	Wynn
(TX)	Poshard	Young (AK)
Jenkins	Price (NC)	Young (FL)

## NAYS—47

Becerra	Lampson	Pelosi
Bonior	Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Borski	Lipinski	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Markey	Rush
Clay	Martinez	Sanders
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stokes
Dellums	McNulty	Thompson
Filner	Miller (CA)	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Torres
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Obey	Waters
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Kilpatrick	Owens	Yates
Kucinich	Payne	

## NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Istook	Pickering
Barton	Jefferson	Schiff
Farr	Johnson (CT)	Souder
Goode	Lantos	Turner
Greenwood	Meek	

□ 1351

Messrs. OLVER, RUSH, and WATT of North Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1525

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 160, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 160, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 4, 1997, at page H3358.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

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

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