

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1903, two brothers in my district of Dayton, Ohio, solved the mystery of flying. Since that first flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright the airplane has changed the course of transportation and commerce and communication and war.

In the year 2003, our Nation will celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the miracle of modern technology, and today my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], and I will introduce legislation to create the Centennial of Flight Commission.

The purpose of the commission is to help coordinate our national celebration of this milestone. This effort is intended to follow other major commemorative celebrations, such as the anniversary of the Constitution and the American Revolutionary War.

We hope that our legislation will help all Americans take pride in our history and renew the value of American ingenuity that made the Wright brothers so successful.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS RE- PORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 201

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to the following measures:

(1) Any resolution reported before August 3, 1997, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) Any resolution reported after July 30, 1997, and before August 3, 1997, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill (H.R. 2014) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 201 waives clause 4(b) of rule XI, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day as it is reported from the Committee on Rules, providing for consideration of specified measures.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 201 applies to rules for the conference report on H.R. 2015, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon reported before August 3, 1997.

□ 1030

In addition, the resolution also applies to rules for the conference report on H.R. 2014, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon reported after July 30, 1997, and before August 3, 1997.

As Members are aware, House rules require a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules. In order to expedite consideration of this historic spending and tax cut package that will balance the budget, the Committee on Rules granted a rule that will waive the two-thirds vote requirement for another rule on the spending cut portion of the budget agreement for Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. The rule would further waive the two-thirds vote requirement for a rule on the tax component for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, the House wants to see the spending cuts conference report on the floor today and the tax cut conference report on the floor tomorrow. We have waited since 1969 for legislation that will bring our Federal budget into balance, and this resolution will help assure that we achieve this goal. The authority granted by this resolution will allow us the flexibility to get the important job done before the August district work period and respond to any changes the other body may make to the legislation through the Byrd rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows us to consider a budget that is a victory for American families and smaller government. It is a budget that will provide this Nation with its first balanced budget in 30 years.

For decades, Congress proved that it could not restrain itself from spending more money than the Treasury collected in revenues. Past Congresses actually managed to spend all revenues and then some.

A new majority arrived in Congress in January 1995 that understand that the solution to our budget woes would be found in controlling spending. When the new Congress arrived, the deficit was \$164 billion. In fiscal year 1996, it dropped to \$107 billion. It will be approximately \$67 billion by the end of fiscal year 1997. There was a report recently that the revenue estimates coming in August may make it even less than that.

There was a chronic growth of Government for decades, but we have been reducing the size of Government constantly. We all know that these significant achievements would have been absolutely unthinkable only 3 years ago.

With the help of this rule, we will fulfill our promise to the American people to balance the budget by cutting wasteful Government spending, preserve, protect, and strengthen Medicare, and produce real tax relief for middle-class families.

House Resolution 202 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Rules yesterday. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution so that we may proceed with debate and consideration of a historic budget that has less Government, less taxes, and more freedom for Americans to spend their money how they see fit.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], for yielding me the customary half hour; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who thought the bipartisanship on the budget was too good to be true was right. Despite agreements with the White House, despite compromises on the part of my Republican colleagues, despite some very hard work by Democrats and Republicans, the Republican leadership has decided to throw bipartisanship right out the window.

The Republican leadership has decided to ram the budget bills through the House with this martial law rule. The Republican leadership, Mr. Speaker, has decided that the many, many days of hard work that went into these bills are not worth giving Members enough time to read them.

The rule we are considering today gives Members hardly any time to read the budget before they vote on it. These bills contain some \$94 billion of tax cuts and \$115 billion in Medicare cuts, \$13 billion in Medicaid cuts, \$1.8 billion in housing cuts. Some people say they are great bills, and I for one want to be able to vote for them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I need to know what is in the bills. I want to vote for tax cuts, but I want to know which tax cuts are in the bill. I want to vote for some of these spending measures, but, again, I want to know what spending measures are in this bill, and this rule certainly does not give me or anyone else in the House that opportunity. If this rule passes, the Republican leadership can bring up the spending and tax parts of the reconciliation bills immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the ink is not even dry yet. Mr. Speaker, 1,000 pages were dropped at my door at 3:30 this morning to read. It is impossible. Members have not even had that opportunity to see this bill. There is nobody, nobody in this House that has read this bill.

This is one of the most important bills we are going to be asked to vote

on this year, and I think the membership should at least have 10 hours to look at this matter in order that they can arm themselves and find out exactly what is in this bill. I think that something this important, this big, should be read as completely as possible before any vote is cast.

So I ask that my colleagues join me in defeating the previous question so we can guarantee that Members have at least 10 hours to read this bill. Mr. Speaker, this is not a dilatory tactic. I want to get out of here as soon as anybody else, but I want to be sure that my vote on this bill is as a result of being well-informed.

Nobody is well-informed on this bill. The only information we in the Congress have, most of us in the Congress have, is what we read in the papers this morning and yesterday or watched on TV. Mr. Speaker, that is not enough. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. And, as I say, Members should at least have the chance to read this bill before we vote on it.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am just shocked that this is the first time this has ever happened. I have been here 5 years, and it never happened before when the Democrats were in charge. We will try to make that better for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY]. There is a pile of paper there. I am in support of this rule, and I think we should move on with the votes today. I will support the tax cutting bill and the balanced budget bill.

As a member of the Committee on Commerce, I have been heavily involved in the Medicare portions; and, so, I feel like I have a pretty firm grasp of what is in that bill. I also have made an extra effort to figure out what is in the tax cutting bill; and on the basis of that knowledge, I feel that I am well-informed and can make a good decision on whether to support these bills.

Let me explain to my colleagues why I am supporting these bills, because I am one of the Republicans who voted against the balanced budget bill earlier this month. The reason that I did that was because I am concerned about how well the economy is going to do. Just like everyone else in this body, I am praying that the economy continues to do well. I was also concerned that we should do a little bit more with reducing spending rather than having more spending in the bill.

However, these two bills that we are talking about have to do with keeping promises. On the tax cutting side of the bill, I made promises before I went to Congress to fulfill a \$500 per child tax credit. And we are doing that.

On the Medicare side, we are making some significant improvements in Med-

icare. For instance, in my home State of Iowa, a health care plan would get paid in some of my rural counties about \$250 per month to provide services for senior citizens; whereas in other parts of the country, we are looking at \$750 per month payment to a health plan. That means senior citizens in those areas can get pharmaceuticals and eyeglasses and hearing aids, even membership in health fitness clubs. Yet, we in Iowa who are paying the same taxes do not get those benefits. This bill will move toward an equalization of that funding formula. That is only fair, and it is very important.

The medical savings accounts. I am very much in favor of medical savings accounts as an option. I believe that senior citizens will take advantage of this. It is not more for the rich and the healthy. There are just as many incentives for those who have illnesses to pick medical savings account.

Fraud. We are tightening up the home health care area with the prospective payment system. In the current Medicare system, we have maybe 20 percent fraud in that program. In the current Medicare system of the bill, in the bill that we are going to be voting on, we are going to tighten up that and reduce that fraud in that component.

In patient protections, I have worked very hard working with the chairman of all of the committees on both sides of the aisle to get some important patient protections in there. I have written a bill, the Patient Right to Know Act, which would ban gag clauses, clauses that HMO's put into their contracts that prevent physicians from telling patients all of their treatment options. And guess what? In this bill, we have a ban on those gag clauses. That bill is cosponsored by 286 Members of this body in a bipartisan manner and is endorsed by over 200 organizations, and it is in the bill. And we have a lay person's definition of an emergency, so that if you have crushing chest pain and you go to the emergency room because you are worried about having a heart attack, you cannot have your coverage denied if they find out that you have an intestinal infection instead.

So there are many important things in this. So we have a funding formula fairness correction. We have medical savings accounts. We are addressing fraud. We have got good consumer and patient protection in the Medicare portion of this bill.

On the tax side, it is promises made, promises kept. We promised middle-class taxpayers a \$500 per child tax credit, and we are delivering on that. There are many things in this bill that will be important for small businesses, for farmers.

I represent a lot of farmers. We are going to have 3-year income averaging for farmers. That is important because some years the crops do not come in, you have bad weather, or whatever, so you have highs and lows. And a 3-year

income averaging will even that out for them.

We have capital gains tax reduction. People say, well, capital gains reduction is for the rich. I tell my colleagues, according to a 1993 IRS study, something like 70 percent of all capital gains that are filed with the IRS are filed by people who earn less than \$75,000. That is not the rich. Capital gains reductions will help those who are selling homes, et cetera.

We have in this bill a movement towards 100 percent deductibility for your health insurance. A bill we passed last year over a period of time would increase out to 80 percent. But in this bill, we are increasing that over a period of time to 100 percent deductibility for the self-employed. That puts them on an even par with people who are receiving their health insurance through a major employer, like General Motors. That is only fair, also.

Finally, we have in this a commission to look at the long term implications of what we need to do for Medicare reform. We, in this bill, are making Medicare solvent for about the next 10 years. But we have got my generation, the baby boomers, coming down the road; and in about 15 years, the baby boomers start to retire and we are going to need to look at pensions and health care entitlements.

So we are setting up a commission that is supposed to report back to Congress and the administration in about 18 months, and then Congress will look at those recommendations and will need to act on that. So I do not think that we are abrogating our responsibility in that area, also.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just close by saying I support this rule. For all of my colleagues who voted against the balanced budget, I think that they should support the tax bill that we are going to be voting on in the next few days and the balanced budget bill.

There are lots and lots of good things in both of these bills. They have been worked on in a bipartisan fashion with the administration and with Members of the opposite aisle. They are good first steps toward financial solvency, balancing the budget, saving Medicare, and providing tax relief for working families.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule, but I want to make it clear that I support this bill. I think we will find that many Members, at least on the Democratic side of the aisle, will vote against the rule even though they do support the bill itself.

Now why would we vote against the rule if we support the bill itself?

□ 1045

We have a responsibility to learn as much as we can about what we are voting on. There are a thousand pages in this bill. None of us will have read it.

What we have to do is to take on faith what is contained in the bill. None of us would read all of the bill, even if we went by regular order and had an entire day. But what we would do is to look at those components of the bill that we have worked on personally, that we understand fully, and that we can advise our colleagues on. We do not have that ability when a thousand-page bill is presented at 3:30 in the morning and then the next morning we have to vote on it. That is what is going to happen today. I think our constituents expect more from us. They expect us to be better informed.

Why are we going to support the bill? What are we taking on faith? Well, this bill would accomplish 10-year deficit savings of \$900 billion. Think of how important this bill is. Nine hundred billion dollars in reduced spending over the next 10 years. It would accomplish the first balanced budget since 1969.

It has \$24 billion in block grants for children's health covering 5 million currently uninsured children. This is the largest expansion of children's health we have done in more than 30 years since Medicaid was enacted in 1965.

It increases taxes on cigarettes in the spending part of this bill, a very controversial issue, although one which I happen to support.

It restores SSI and Medicaid benefits to legal immigrants. It spends \$3 billion in grants for welfare to work. It increases spending on food stamps by \$1.5 billion for people who otherwise would have fallen through the cracks.

It cuts Medicare by \$115 billion in 5 years, reducing payments to hospitals and doctors so that we can keep the Medicare trust fund solvent, but we need to know the particulars of that.

It cuts \$4.8 billion from Federal employees' retirement plans, a very controversial issue, particularly in an area such as I represent where we have many Federal employees that are going to be paying half a percent more for their retirement plan. I would like to see the full legislative language on that.

It cuts \$1.8 billion in student loans and \$1.8 billion in housing over 5 years.

These are very controversial, very important issues. As we understand them, the decisions that were made were understandable compromises in virtually every case. But again we are having to take this on faith. I do think that the country would have been better served had this rule given the Members of this body a customary full day, as we normally have. There is a reason for that rule, so that if one is interested in an issue, they can take 24 hours and make sure that they know what they are voting on. We could be staying in Friday, we could have a full day, and we would have the opportunity to be knowledgeably voting on as important a bill as this body has considered for a very long time. We would be able to be much more responsible with respect to our vote which is what our constituents expect of us.

We have gotten into a pattern of waiving these rules. We ought to understand there is a reason for these rules, there is a reason why they should be followed, and I think we need to oppose this rule, although from everything we can learn that we have been told by others that were in the negotiations, a handful of people that were actually part of the negotiations, this is a bill we can and we should support and I would urge support for the balanced budget agreement itself.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am entertained by the crocodile tears that I hear about the length of time not to read the bill when everybody knows they would not have read it anyway. I believe it was in 1984 when Speaker Wright brought a \$1.3 trillion budget to the floor with 1 hour notice and even the Committee on Rules did not see it.

Let me tell my colleagues what is in this bill. A significant part of the problem with large Government programs has been the Soviet-style administration of them, the central command economy that decides on high what a doctor should earn, what a hospital visit should pay for. And over time, these all become absolutely rife with fraud. We just learned 2 weeks ago that an audit of the Health Care Financing Administration shows that about \$23 billion a year is wasted in fraud, overpayment, and misuse. The records are in such disarray that we do not even know at the Federal level who is overpaid and how to recover it, and indeed we discovered in that audit that many people were writing checks or signing checks for the Health Care Financing Administration of the Federal Government without the legal authority to do so. This bill begins to crack down on that fraud. That \$23 billion per year over 5 years is exactly how much we are reducing the rate of growth in the increase in spending of Medicare and it is taken out by just fraud and abuse.

We heard last week that in administering home health care across this country, roughly 40 percent could be fraud. As much as 40 percent is going to people who are not in homes, being treated for home health care, not unable to leave their homes. Going to the prospective payment system is going to eliminate the incentive to do that. We are going to change the way we deliver these services so that we have less incentive to cheat and more incentive to save.

The ability to provide not the \$500 child tax credit to low-income working families, that only goes to people who have actual obligations to the Federal Government, but by changing the way in which we provide the formula for the earned income credit, after having learned that 21 percent of the money being spent in the earned income credit is fraudulent; by changing the formulas, the administration and the White House has decided that they can find ways to save \$4.5 billion in that

program and use that to enhance their earned income credit for low-income working people to replace what the \$500-per-child tax credit does for higher earning families. By changing the model, the structure of the delivery of these services from the large Federal command-style bureaucracies, so well known by the Soviet Union that we seem to have adopted here, and getting out the fraud and abuse, we are confident that we can save hundreds of billions of dollars over time and provide better services with the money we are spending.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with hesitation and reservation about the rule, but with strong support for the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this certainly is history in the making, and we do not use that term lightly when we bring both the tax cut and the spending bill before this body. This bill will receive my strong support both on the tax and the spending side because it helps small children, it helps small businesses and small farmers and it helps make Government smaller and smarter. It does that by structurally balancing the budget and balancing the budget with the right priorities. Structurally balancing the budget so we borrow \$900 billion less but we also create new programs for children, new programs for education, restructure Medicare to extend its solvency by a decade to help our senior citizens. It is the right values to balance the budget and the right values on people. So I will strongly support this.

What does the \$900 billion mean for us? That spending side of \$900 billion in less borrowing is almost a tax cut by itself. That helps the American people by hopefully lowering their payments on mortgages and interest rates and helps the economy.

The other part, what about the tax cut part? What about the spending part on children's initiatives? I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill for kids' initiatives for health came out of this body with \$16 billion. It is now before this body with \$24 billion, the largest expenditure on children's health since 1965 with the creation of Medicaid; the largest program for uninsured children in 32 years. I strongly support that.

I strongly support what this does for Pell grants. The largest increase in Pell grants in the history of the Pell grant program. We will spend more in new innovative ways to reform and modify education than the Great Society in the 1960's. This is a bill that helps our small farmers and small businesses, balances the budget, borrows less money, creates smaller and smarter Government, and I hope it receives bipartisan support.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments with respect to his comments on the Pell grants and funding for education. We are going to, without reducing any of the amounts of the numbers of students available for them, save \$1.7 billion in improving the way they are administered, and that is a real savings that governments ought to look to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me this time.

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, what we can do, the President and the Congress, when we work together in a bipartisan, pragmatic way for this country. That is why we are here today on an historic threshold, and I rise in strong support of the legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker, which will balance the budget and expand health care choices for the seniors of our country while preserving and protecting Medicare.

Not only do we save Medicare from bankruptcy but we build a strong foundation so that Medicare can be preserved for the next generation. We give seniors the increased health care coverage where they need it most, Mr. Speaker, before they become ill, by increasing the amount of preventive care covered by Medicare.

There are a few specific reforms I would like to highlight. One is the reforms we make to the AAPCC reimbursement formula. That reform, very, very important to cost-effective States like Minnesota that have historically delivered health care in a cost effective way. What we do by changing the reimbursement formula is expand choices for seniors in States like Minnesota, those that have been efficient in their costs and in their quality. This is a major reform, Mr. Speaker, in the Medicare managed care reimbursement formula. It will mean more equity for States like Minnesota and more health care options for Medicare beneficiaries in our State and others like ours.

Incorporating a bill that I introduced earlier this year, this legislation before us today will establish a payment floor and will blend the formula to bring fairness and equity to beneficiaries living in rural and efficient provider States like Minnesota.

The bill also includes an important new study of ways to provide health care to seniors to let them stay in their homes longer, to let them live independently longer by extending for 2 years the community nursing organization demonstration project. I think, Mr. Speaker, this reform will prove to be one of the most important reforms ever in Medicare. These very important community nursing organizations allow seniors to stay in their homes, to make their choice of staying in their

homes as long as possible and at the same time saving Medicare dollars. This CNO, community nursing organization demonstration project, is vital to seniors in Minnesota and all over the country who have enrolled in this project.

I am also pleased that this bill includes a provision to help certain hospitals that have merged with nursing homes meet necessary requirements to maintain appropriate geographical classification. This means a great deal to a hospital in Hutchinson, Minnesota. I am glad we were able to make this necessary change in the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank the conferees for making all the necessary changes to Medicare to save this absolutely vital system for the seniors of our country.

From extending the life of the Medicare trust fund, to ensuring quality care as a major tenet of the centers of excellence program, I commend the conferees for their hard work on behalf of current and future Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this important legislation to preserve and protect Medicare and urge all my colleagues to support it as well and to continue working in a bipartisan, pragmatic way for the betterment of America.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, and I want to stress that it is not because of the underlying bill.

I feel very strongly that this spending bill does include a major program to cover uninsured children in this country and I am pleased with the fact that we have managed, I believe as Democrats, and particularly the President, in pushing the Republicans towards inclusion of a \$24 billion package that will insure the majority of the Nation's uninsured children.

□ 1100

But it is for that very reason, because this bill is so important, that I think it is very unfair and wrong to present this bill at this time without having the opportunity to review the specifics of the measure. The bill, as my colleagues can see, is about a foot thick. I understand it was filed at around 3 o'clock in the morning. I have not had the opportunity to review all of the provisions in the bill. We did receive a summary of the bill this morning, but I think it is fair to say that a summary is not adequate.

Let me just give my colleagues an example on the kids' health initiative, which is such an important initiative and which I support wholeheartedly, but there are a number of things that we still do not know.

For example, many of us, including myself, on our Democratic Health Care Task Force were concerned about the benefits package. We knew we wanted

to have the \$24 billion, and we wanted to insure the majority of the kids. But we were concerned about whether the benefits package would be adequate, and language was put in and was negotiated in the last 24 hours on that, which I hope provides an adequate benefits package, but without reviewing the specifics of the bill myself and my other colleagues, we will not know whether it is completely adequate.

Similarly, we were concerned to make sure that the money was going to be spent so that States had to actually insure kids and not whittle it away or use it for other purposes. I understand in the summary we received this morning that 15 percent of the funds can be used for purposes other than to insure kids. Well, I would like to know the details of that and how specifically that 15 percent is set aside. We do not know that, and until we analyze it we will not know it.

And in addition to that, again on the kids' health care initiative, we were concerned, many of us on the Democratic side, to make sure that States had to keep providing the same level of funds, if not more funds, than they had in the past for kids' health care. We wanted to make sure the maintenance of effort, if my colleagues will, was in there. And we are not actually clear about the language for that as well.

So I want to join my colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, in saying, "Yes, we think this is a good bill, and we probably will vote for it, but it's not fair not to have the details, and there is no reason why we couldn't wait in this Congress another 24 hours so that everyone, including our staff, had the opportunity to review the details in something that is so important to this Congress and to the American people."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

This is not just an esoteric procedural debate. I was insulted when the gentleman on the other said, "Well, so what if we're bringing up this bill delivered, one copy, to the Democratic side at 3:30 in the morning. They wouldn't have read it any way." Well, I was here a few years ago, and I read the catastrophic care bill before it came to the floor of the House. I was one of the few Democrats to vote against it, and a whole heck of a lot of people had to change their votes a year later because they cast their vote for a bad bill.

This bill is a bad bill. I will not yield to the gentleman. This bill is a bad bill. But we are not going to be allowed time to read it. If we split this up among the 200 or so Democrats here, we would have a hard time getting through it in the time allotted.

We are going to vote on this bill within the next three hours. Do my colleagues know why? Because it is

going to make prime time news. That is why we are going to vote on it.

This is an Alice in Wonderland budget process. We are going to get to the balanced budget by first increasing the deficit with retroactive tax cuts. It is slanted very much toward the wealthy people and the largest corporations in America. Then maybe later, we have heard this before, these cuts will go in place.

Do my colleagues know what the cuts are? A one-third cut in Social Security Administration. If someone has to wait 3 months now to get their claim processed, under this bill they will be waiting 6 months, 9 months or a year to get their claim processed. A 20 percent cut in veterans and cuts in other vital programs.

This is not a good path to the balanced budget. In fact, it is no path whatsoever.

This is stranger and stranger. We have stepped through the looking glass, it is getting more and more bizarre. This is no kind of a legislative process. No one on the floor can come to the floor today and say they have read this bill, they understand it and they are voting for it in good faith. That would be a lie.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, what a difference 4 years makes. It was a mere 4 years ago that a Democratic Congress, led by a Democratic President, passed the largest tax increase in American history. Today a Republican Congress will pass a budget that will be balanced by the year 2002. This Republican-led balanced budget will provide tax relief for families. It provides \$24 billion to States for children's health, it provides \$3 billion for welfare to work programs, and it saves Medicare for 10 years.

Yes, what a difference 4 years makes.

Tomorrow a Republican Congress will pass the first tax relief package for working Americans in 16 years. This Republican-led package provides \$94 billion in tax relief over the next 5 years. It allows for a \$500 per child tax credit, reduces the top rate of capital gains from 28 to 20 percent, and, most importantly, it provides immediate tax relief for the death tax for family farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this budget and this tax relief package is good for America. I am proud to join in support of this monumental agreement and support the rule and passage of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate that my argument is not against the spending bill, it is against the process, just asking that Members have enough time to read the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from

Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member, for yielding me this time, and I can tell my colleagues, having been chairman of the Committee on Rules in my State legislature in Rhode Island, I know martial law when I see it, I know a bad rule when I see it, and this is a terrible rule. When we consider the monumental bill that we have before us, that does so many huge things to this country, to think that we are going to have a debate about it for less than an hour and a half to me is just outrageous.

First of all, think about this budget. This budget is not going to be balanced when we consider that we are going to front-load the tax cuts to the tune of \$95 billion, and we are going to call on the spending cuts to be done in future congresses, spending cuts like the former gentleman from Oregon mentioned, up to one-third of the Social Security Administration spending cuts.

I can tell my colleagues now this Congress is not going to keep the promise to cut Social Security administrative costs by 23 percent. Veterans benefits and services; it is going to cut 19 percent. Justice Department; it is going to be cut 18 percent.

Now just tell me that the next Congress is going to make these cuts? I can guarantee that the tax cuts are not going to be tampered with. The tax cuts are going to be locked in, and we are not going to make the necessary cuts on the spending side because this Congress, because it will be listening to the people, will not make those cuts.

This is bad for Medicare. It cuts \$115 billion out of Medicare. Remember, we shut the Government down 2 years ago because of cuts that rivaled this for Medicare, yet no one is going to think twice about cutting \$115 billion out of Medicare. Furthermore, they put 190,000 senior citizens in medical savings accounts. Anybody who knows this knows this is the beginning of the end of Medicare because they are going to take the healthiest and wealthiest of our senior citizens and they are going to take them out of the Medicare system, thereby ruining the system because all they are going to leave are the people who cannot pay and who are sick.

So they are going to terrorize the Medicare System by not only cutting \$115 billion, but they are going to, through this Medicare select and privatization of Medicare, lead to its eventual undoing.

Remember the Speaker's dying on the vine that he attributed to Medicare? This is the beginning of it right now, and this is going to be in the bill that everyone is going to vote for this afternoon.

And, finally, this is bad not only for the budget, as I talked about, because it front-loads the taxes and does not allow for spending cuts to be made until future congresses, bad for Medicare, but it is also bad for fairness. Do my colleagues realize that the top 5 percent of the income earners in this

country are going to get four times; let me repeat this, the top 5 percent get four times what the bottom 60 percent get in this tax bill. Undisputed, my colleagues cannot deny me on that. That is fact. Get it, people? Top 5 percent in this country get 60 percent of the benefits, four times what the bottom 60 percent get. That is fact.

So whatever people talk about this being a fair bill is bogus. This is not a fair bill. And, my colleagues, know what? Finally this, the Republican side, and I might add many of my colleagues on the Democratic side, will not even bring out the income distribution charts. They will not want to tell us where this deal, so to speak, really who it benefits. The reason is because we are not going to have enough time on the floor today to debate this. What we are considering right now is called a martial law. What that means is we better be thankful we even have a right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dictatorship that what we are talking about here under martial law. It says, "OK, read the newspaper, everybody, because you're not going to be able to read the agreement, because it's not going to be available to the Members of this Congress." I want to know as a Member of Rhode Island's delegation whether I am going to be able to go home and ask my constituents what they feel about this agreement when they know what is in this agreement. They do not know what is in this agreement.

I say to my colleagues today they do not know what is in this agreement, they do not know how this is going to gut Medicare, they do not know this is going to destroy veterans and the like, and I can tell my colleagues they are leaving it to future congresses to do the dirty work. That is what this budget agreement is all about, it is promises that are not going to be kept in future congresses.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to yield myself 1 minute to point out to the gentleman from Rhode Island that rules of the House require that he address his comments either to the Chair or the House, not to the gallery; and, No. 2, his argument that the top 4 percent gets 60 percent of the benefits, or whatever, only is true if we use phony numbers to define who is wealthy; and, No. 3, I am curious to know when he referred to the former member from Oregon, the former gentleman from Oregon, whether it was formerly a gentleman or formerly from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was upstairs. We were just having a Committee on Rules meeting, and we bring down the rule which will bring this magnificent piece of legislation to the floor. But I just am really taken aback by some of the comments by the last 2 speakers on the Democrat side of the

aisle, and I would just point to the signers of this conference, and one of those is a gentleman by the name of CHARLES RANGEL from New York.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill in any way, either this bill or the tax bill to follow it tomorrow, did any of the things that the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from Oregon said it did, I can tell my colleagues that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], who has stood up for the indigent and poor of this country, and I will yield to my colleague when I am done perhaps, CHARLES RANGEL would never, never in a million years, sign this conference report.

Let me just say that the gentleman protests that he has not had a chance to look at the bill. This bill here was in front of the Committee on Rules at 3:14 and a half this morning down in room 152. It was given to the minority in the Committee on the Budget much earlier than that so that there have been 15 hours for people to sit down and talk to; I am talking about people on that side of the aisle, talk to distinguished Members from their party that have signed this conference report and know everything that is in it. Those members are people like the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, and I will yield when I am finished, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] from the more conservative wing of the Democratic Party, and my colleagues know I can just go on, and on, and on: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who would never ever sign a bill, a conference report, as described by the previous two Democratic speakers. And as my colleagues know, they can look on through these signatures: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], who is a very liberal member of the Democratic Party, but one of the most respected Members because he is very sincere in his beliefs.

□ 1115

Incidentally, he has two great sons that serve in the military, in an honorable career in our military. There is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE]. Again, we can go on and on. There is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE EVANS], a noted liberal from Illinois; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

My point is this, Mr. Speaker: Everyone has to compromise. I have offered legislation on this floor that would have balanced the budget in 1 year, not 2, 3, 4, 5 or 7. I can remember getting only 16 votes for it. I can remember another time bringing a budget to the floor when my conservative group only got 75 votes, and then 99 votes.

But this is truly a bipartisan effort from liberals, from conservatives. We ought to be here working together on this legislation. We should not be here trying to tear each other apart on it. I

think this matter is going to pass overwhelmingly with bipartisan, overwhelming support on the Democratic side, as well as almost every, if not every, Republican in this House. That is the way it should be.

Ronald Reagan once said to me that we cannot stick to our principles solely, because there is a House of Representatives, there is a Senate, and there is a White House. We all have to give a little. I think everybody has given a little.

I am going to give credit to the President of the United States of America, because he has given, too, as we Republicans have, to put together what is truly a great program that is going to mean that the future of my children and my grandchildren and all of the Members' are going to have a future in this country, and they are going to have a life as good as we have had when we were growing up. That is what we are here to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is this is a monumental agreement. The gentleman would agree with me on that?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, it is.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. It effects \$95 billion in tax cuts, 395,000 seniors going into Medicare Select, MSA's, all the cuts that are going to ensue, 15 percent in goals cuts, veterans, Social Security Administration, all that is to come down the road.

All I am saying to the gentleman is under martial law, we have an hour and a half to debate that. The gentleman points out, rightfully so, that there are a lot of good Members on my side of the aisle who signed onto this. But that does not excuse the fact that we will not have adequate time to debate something that I might add, if the gentleman would yield further for a second, that I might add would consume months of debate in future Congresses. The decision we are going to make today and tomorrow is going to impact enormously on the future of this country. Yet we have an hour and a half to decide something so huge.

Yet we are going to dilly-dally and spend months and months debating appropriations bills in future Congresses over just finite parts of this budget deal in the future.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just have to reclaim my time to say to the gentleman, it is not an hour and a half. Under normal rules of the House we are having 1½ hours of debate, but we are having an extra hour on the rule we are bringing up; we will have an extra hour, so the gentleman is talking about 3½ hours of time.

All of the Members on both sides of the aisle have been briefed. I have sat through 17 hours of briefing on what is in this legislation. The White House has done the same thing with Members

on the Democratic side of the aisle. So we have had ample time to discuss what is in this legislation.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply like to respond to my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Rhode Island, that if we look at this debate that we are going to be having on this issue, it is really the culmination of what for many of us has been a decade or a decade and a half of debate on these issues.

My friend is relatively new to this body, and I think that he clearly should spend a lot of time discussing and looking at these questions. But the fact of the matter is, 90 minutes is not going to be the full debate time for this question.

In fact, we just had testimony upstairs, and let me just say that if we look at the fact that we 12 years ago introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of medical savings accounts, which my friend just raised, we have been debating that issue for well over 10 years.

So this really is the culmination of a very great, great accomplishment that has been done in a bipartisan way, and that is why I am strongly supportive of this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my chairman was on the floor when I spoke, and I know he was not, he was attending to his duties, but this debate this morning right now is not about the spending bill. It is about the process. I just feel, and he said, this bill was dropped at my doorstep at 3:15 this morning. It is not enough time, not only for me but for the rest of the Members. To quote one of his favorite men in public office, Ronald Reagan, he said, "Trust, but verify." All I want to do is verify.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today Speaker GINGRICH seeks our approval of a resolution on a subject that this Republican Congress has quite obviously developed considerable expertise in. That subject is ignorance. Normally ignorance is demonstrated here in this House in ignoring the needs of the ordinary hard-working American family. Today that ignorance is demonstrated in a much more obvious way.

We know that an agreement was put together in the dead of night and presented to a committee, that copies of the bill are not even out here, that no one has seen this bill. Perhaps that is a bit of an overstatement. We have seen the bill. This is it. If Members have a photographic memory, perhaps they can see it right now. It is about a foot high. It weighs several pounds. It has what the Washington Post and the

Washington Times, two papers of very differing views, both describe as significant increases in spending, in social spending. In fact, this bill represents billions, if not trillions, of dollars in spending that the American taxpayer will be asked to finance.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the Members on the Republican side who are speaking in favor of this martial law rule do not have the slightest idea what is in most of this several pounds, and that indeed few Members of this Congress, if any, know what is in that bill in terms of spending hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

No, the ignorance resolution they ask us to approve this morning is based on that fundamental principle that got us into some of this mess in the first place; that is, that we should vote first and read later.

I am for the principle of a balanced budget, just do not confuse me with the details. I do not want to take the pep out of their pep rally, but those of us who tried to get a meaningful enforcement provision on this budget, both in the Committee on the Budget and on the floor of this Congress, do not want a budget that is balanced for a millisecond. We do not want to approve hundreds of billions of dollars of new spending without knowing what it is going to do and without actually reading the bill. Who knows what provisions for special interests are buried in these pounds of new spending?

We need the opportunity, not just for this House but for the American people, to have an opportunity to see what is in this bill, to understand it. If it is that great, it can stand the test of time, not a matter of a few minutes.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding time to me, and I would address my comments to my colleagues and to the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly, as many speakers have already said this morning, have seen a historic agreement reached. It certainly is uncommon for us to see a major controversial piece of legislation drawing support from the White House, from the Republican leadership in both the House and Senate, and from most of the Democratic leadership in the House and Senate. It is a massive bill.

This morning we have been treated to repeated demonstrations of the size of the bill and the awkwardness of even trying to work one's way through it. I think it is fairly safe to say that nobody in this body will have a chance to review this bill in detail before it is voted on.

It has large provisions which most of us are familiar with and most of us probably agree with. It has small provisions that only a few of us know about

because they affect our areas. I would like to just mention one of them which I think is of significance to American agriculture, to point out that this is typical of small things that find their way into big bills.

We have labored in American agriculture with a very restrictive ruling from the Internal Revenue Service that prohibited farmers from taking advantage of deferred payment contracts. It is because of the alternative minimum tax. This legislation corrects that.

Many say the devil is in the details. If this is the type of detail, I think we have had an exorcist that has taken the devil out. But the question is, how many other details are there that we have not had a chance to examine, and do we need to give that exorcist more time?

On a larger scale, I would like to say in concluding that I think that there are some very significant omissions in this legislation:

Social Security. We are borrowing this year \$79 billion to balance the budget with Social Security. By the year 2002, it will be over \$110 billion.

Medicare. We have a temporary fix to Medicare. We do not have a long-term fix.

Finally, enforcement. Many of us on both sides of the aisle have struggled for enforcement provisions in this legislation. We have been rebuffed. I think it is absolutely critical that we move ahead with enforcement provisions before this session of Congress ends.

I anticipate supporting this legislation, but I am a reluctant supporter. I urge that we focus on these deficiencies.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that unlike 1984 when Speaker Wright brought a \$1.3 trillion budget to the floor with 1 hour's notice, not even letting the Committee on Rules see it, everybody in America could have read this. The full text of this budget is on the Internet, Speakernews.house.gov. Speakernews is one word. The Members can do it on the Democratic side even as we speak.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the legislation that we received this morning. On principle, nobody in this House should vote for legislation which he does not understand, has not seen, and contains hundreds and hundreds of pages with many provisions that we know nothing about.

But Mr. Speaker, we do know some of the aspects that we are going to be asked to vote on. We do know that in a time when millions of elderly people are unable to pay for their prescription drugs, when they are paying more and more for private insurance to cover what Medicare does not cover, we do know that we are going to be asked to cut Medicare by \$115 billion. That is wrong. We also know there are signifi-

cant cuts in the Social Security Administration and in veterans programs. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, in order to pay for the cuts in Medicare, in the Social Security Administration, and in veterans programs, what the Congress is proposing is to provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, unfortunately; precisely the people who do not need it. The wealthiest 5 percent of Americans will receive almost half of the tax cuts. The upper 20 percent will receive over 70 percent of the benefits. The upper 1 percent, when this plan is full-blown, the upper 1 percent will receive more benefits from this package than the bottom 80 percent.

So the people who really need the help are not getting the help. The people who do not need the help are getting more help than they are entitled to. Under this plan, the average tax cut for middle-income families and individuals will be less than \$200. The wealthiest 1 percent, however, will receive over \$16,000 in tax breaks.

□ 1130

As the New York Times said today in an editorial, and I quote:

Even after last minute horse trading around the edges, the deal remains unfairly tilted in favor of the better off citizens of society. It drills scores of new loopholes into the tax code, mostly for the benefit of very wealthy families at the cost of opening up large deficits early next century conveniently beyond the 10-year period that the deal tracks.

In other words, what is going to happen is, 10 years from now, when we have all of these loopholes for the wealthy and for large corporations, we are going to be back here again with another huge deficit and we are going to have Members here saying, we have got to cut more into Medicare, more into Social Security, more into veterans programs, more into housing. So my friends, before we pass a budget like this, first of all, have the courage to look at it and, second of all, let us not balance the budget on the backs of the weak and the vulnerable in order to give huge tax breaks to the wealthy.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying that the top 5 percent get four times the tax cut as the bottom 60 percent?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are some Members that would like to put off a decision on balancing the budget and having tax cuts. There are some Members that would hope that we could discuss this enough that they might discourage the President from going along with this tax cut and balanced budget for the American people. Regarding the questions whether

we have had time to review this legislation, we never have enough time for each Member to totally understand the text of this legislation without the help of specialists. Look at Medicare, which is the large portion of this bill.

It is essentially the same Medicare proposal that was offered by the Republicans over 2 years ago. It is the same Medicare bill that was demagogued last year in the election. Obviously Members have had 2 years to review that proposal. If we want to look at the other provisions of this bill, many are similar and we have talked about them since we voted on similar change in 1995.

This legislation, this agreement has been on the table since last April in terms of what Republicans and Democrats working together actually signed off on a detailed agreement. We are doing what the American people want us to do. That is balancing the budget and cutting taxes. There is a lot more to do but this is a good start.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am not going to vote for this bill because I cannot even find the bill. I went down to the Clerk's office just now because I was told that is where the only copy of the bill was. In fact, I was told that it was filed at the Government Printing Office at 4:15 this morning. So then we call over to the Committee on Ways and Means. I said, I will run over to the Committee on Ways and Means and get the bill. I call over to the Committee on Ways and Means, and they said, we have only got the sections that deal with our committee. We have got Social Security, we have got Medicare, we have got Medicaid.

I said, let us take a look and see if it is up in the Committee on Rules. They said, no, the Committee on Rules does not have the bill. Maybe there is one copy down on the floor, maybe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], maybe the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] have that copy.

Then I said, well, let us go to the web site. So we went to Thomas.loc.gov. Guess what? The bill is not on the web site. I am not elected by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I am not elected by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY]. I am elected by the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Ohio. I cannot get a bill, and I do not want to listen to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] because he did not elect me. The people back in Ohio elected me.

To bring this kind of a bill to the floor today and tomorrow, what is the rush? Are we afraid the American people might actually know what is in this bill and would not want us to vote on this until September when we have had

a chance to study the bill? What is the rush? I can see a fast ball when it comes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

I would like to give this to my colleagues: Speakernews..House.gov.

The World Wide Web has it. It is there. It has been there since early this morning. Obviously my friend did not move to the appropriate site.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would love to know why the Clerk's office did not know what site it was at?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, because I had not stood here yet to announce it: Speakernews.House.gov. That is maybe why the Clerk did not know it yet. The fact is, it is there. It can be found. At 3:14 this morning my very dear friend from Glens Falls pulled another all-nighter. He went right to the office of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] and delivered this thing.

It was delivered at 3:14 this morning. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] wanted to take it to the house of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], but his better judgment told him to simply take it to the office at 3:14 in the morning. This is in fact a very good package. We should move ahead with it as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. Speaker, despite what we heard at the microphone from my very dear friend, if one calls up the Speaker's line, you will get a summary. This bill is not in print anywhere except the copies that I have and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has. It will not even be in the Congressional RECORD until tomorrow. We are talking about the bill itself.

If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which would make certain that Members will have no less than 10 hours to read the bills before the House begins to consider them. I believe that is only fair for major bills such as these.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the amendment to which I referred:

At the end of the resolution add the following:

"SEC. 2. The waiver prescribed in the first section of this resolution shall not apply to a resolution providing for consideration of any measure unless the measure has been available to Members for at least 10 hours before the consideration of such resolution."

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

Let me point out that the White House, the conferees have read every word, every summary, every piece of it. And every bill that comes through here

we have to trust the folks on the committee or on the conference report to give us the best advice. They have done that. We have got some of the most distinguished Democrats in this House who have signed onto this bill. They know what is in it. We have been debating some of these issues for 3 and 4 years. This is a specious argument to try and delay the action on a very good bill. Most of the arguments against the process have come from the most liberal Members who do not like the bill. I think that is curious.

Let me say, this is a rule that we have used in the past under Democrats and Republicans. It is a rule that should be supported as well as the bills.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GIBBONS]. 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. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting if ordered on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 201, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Coburn	Goode
Archer	Collins	Goodlatte
Armey	Combest	Goodling
Bachus	Condit	Goss
Baker	Cook	Graham
Ballenger	Cooksey	Granger
Barr	Cox	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Crane	Gutknecht
Bartlett	Crapo	Hansen
Barton	Cubin	Hastert
Bass	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Hayworth
Bereuter	Deal	Hefley
Bilbray	DeLay	Herger
Bilirakis	Dickey	Hill
Bliley	Doolittle	Hilleary
Blunt	Dreier	Hobson
Boehlert	Duncan	Hoekstra
Boehner	Dunn	Horn
Bonilla	Ehlers	Hostettler
Bono	Ehrlich	Houghton
Brady	Emerson	Hulshof
Bryant	English	Hunter
Bunning	Ensign	Hutchinson
Burr	Everett	Hyde
Burton	Ewing	Inglis
Buyer	Fawell	Istook
Callahan	Foley	Jenkins
Calvert	Fowler	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Jones
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Kasich
Cannon	Galleghy	Kelly
Castle	Ganske	Kim
Chabot	Gekas	King (NY)
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kingston
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	Klug
Christensen	Gillmor	Knollenberg
Coble	Gilman	Kolbe

LaHood Paxon Shuster Strickland Torres Waxman Nussle Ros-Lehtinen Stenholm
 Largent Pease Skeen Stupak Towns Wexler Oxley Roukema Stump
 Latham Peterson (MN) Stupak Turner Weygand Packard Royce Sununu
 LaTourette Peterson (PA) Smith (NJ) Tauscher Velazquez Wise Pappas Ryun Talent
 Leach Petri Smith (OR) Taylor (MS) Vento Woolsey Parker Salmon Tanner
 Lewis (CA) Pickering Smith (TX) Thompson Visclosky Wynn Sanford Tauscher
 Lewis (KY) Pitts Smith, Linda Thurman Waters Wynn Sanford Tauscher
 Linder Pombo Snowbarger Tierney Watt (NC) Yates Paul Saxton Tauzin
 Livingston Porter Solomon Souder Diaz-Balart Gonzalez Young (AK) Paxon Scarborough Taylor (NC)
 LoBiondo Portman Pryce (OH) Foglietta Lazio Peterson (MN) Pease Schaefer, Dan Thomas
 Lucas Quinn Stearns Peterson (PA) Schaffer, Bob Thornberry
 Manzullo Radanovich Stump Sessions Sensenbrenner Thune
 McCollum Ramstad Sununu Pickering Shadegg Torres
 McCrery Redmond Talent Pitts Shimkus Trafficant
 McDade Regula Upton Pomo Shinkus Upton
 McHugh Riggs Taylor (NC) Porter Shuster Walsh
 McInnis Rigs Taylor (NC) Portman Skeen Wamp
 McIntosh Riley Thomas Watkins
 McKeon Rogan Thornberry Smith (MI) Smith (NJ) Watts (OK)
 Metcalf Rogers Thune Smith (OR) Smith (TX) Weldon (FL)
 Mica Rohrabacher Tiaht Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX) Weldon (PA)
 Miller (FL) Roukema Upton Weller
 Molinari Royce Walsh Weller
 Moran (KS) Ryun Wamp White
 Morella Salmon Watkins Wicker
 Myrick Sanford Watts (OK) Wolf
 Nethercutt Saxton Weldon (FL) Young (FL)
 Neumann Scarbrough Weller
 Ney Schaefer, Dan White
 Northup Schaffer, Bob Whitfield
 Norwood Sensenbrenner Wicker
 Nussle Sessions Wolf
 Oxley Shadegg Shaw
 Packard Pappas Shays
 Parker Parker Shimkus Paul

NAYS—201

Abercrombie Ford McIntyre
 Ackerman Frank (MA) McKinney
 Allen Frost McNulty
 Andrews Furse Meehan
 Baesler Gejdenson Meek
 Baldacci Gephardt Menendez
 Barcia Gordon Millender-
 Barrett (WI) Green McDonald
 Becerra Gutierrez Miller (CA)
 Bentsen Hall (OH) Minge
 Berman Hall (TX) Mink
 Berry Hamilton Moakley
 Bishop Harman Mollohan
 Blagojevich Hastings (FL) Moran (VA)
 Blumenauer Hefner Murtha
 Bonior Hilliard Nadler
 Borski Hinchey Neal
 Boswell Hinojosa Oberstar
 Boucher Holden Obey
 Boyd Hooley Oliver
 Brown (CA) Hoyer Ortiz
 Brown (FL) Jackson (IL) Owens
 Brown (OH) Jackson-Lee Pallone
 Capps (TX) Pascrell
 Cardin Jefferson Pastor
 Carson John Payne
 Clay Johnson (WI) Pelosi
 Clayton Johnson, E. B. Pickett
 Clement Kanjorski Pomeroy
 Clyburn Kaptur Poshard
 Conyers Kennedy (MA) Price (NC)
 Costello Kennedy (RI) Rahall
 Coyne Kennelly Rangel
 Cramer Kildee Reyes
 Cummings Kilpatrick Rivers
 Danner Kind (WI) Rodriguez
 Davis (FL) Kleczka Roemer
 Davis (IL) Klink Rothman
 DeFazio Kucinich Roybal-Allard
 DeGette LaFalce Rush
 Delahunt Lampson Sabo
 DeLauro Lantos Sanchez
 Dellums Levin Sanders
 Deutsch Lewis (GA) Sandlin
 Dicks Lipinski Sawyer
 Dingell Lofgren Schumer
 Dixon Lowey Scott
 Doggett Luther Serrano
 Dooley Maloney (CT) Sherman
 Doyle Maloney (NY) Sisisky
 Edwards Manton Skaggs
 Engel Markey Skelton
 Eshoo Martinez Slaughter
 Etheridge Mascara Smith, Adam
 Evans Matsui Snyder
 Farr McCarthy (MO) Spratt
 Fattah McCarthy (NY) Stabenow
 Fazio McDermott Stark
 Filner McGovern Stenholm
 Flake McHale Stokes

Torres Towns Wexler
 Turner Weygand
 Velazquez Wise
 Vento Woolsey
 Visclosky Wynn
 Waters Yates
 Watt (NC)
 NOT VOTING—7
 Diaz-Balart Gonzalez Young (AK)
 Foglietta Lazio
 Forbes Schiff

□ 1156

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Messrs. BOSWELL, JOHN, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, 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 237, nays 187, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—237

Aderholt Danner Hunter
 Archer Davis (VA) Hutchinson
 Arney Deal Hyde
 Bachus DeLay Inglis
 Baker Diaz-Balart Jenkins
 Ballenger Dickey Johnson (CT)
 Barr Dooley Johnson, Sam
 Barrett (NE) Dreier Jones
 Bartlett Duncan Kasich
 Barton Dunn Kelly
 Bass Ehlers Kim
 Bateman Ehrlich Kind (WI)
 Bereuter Emerson King (NY)
 Bilbray English Kingston
 Bilirakis Everett Kleczka
 Biley Ewing Klug
 Blunt Fawell Knollenberg
 Boehlert Foley Kolbe
 Boehner Fowler LaHood
 Bonilla Fox Largent
 Bono Franks (NJ) Latham
 Boswell Frelinghuysen LaTourette
 Brady Gallegly Leach
 Bryant Ganske Lewis (CA)
 Bunning Gekas Lewis (KY)
 Burr Gibbons Linder
 Burton Gilchrist Lipinski
 Buyer Gillmor Livingston
 Callahan Gilman LoBiondo
 Camp Goodlatte Lucas
 Campbell Goodling Manton
 Canady Gordon Manzullo
 Cannon Goss McCollum
 Castle Granger McCrery
 Chabot Greenwood McDade
 Chambliss Gutknecht McHugh
 Chenoweth Hansen McNinnis
 Coble Hastert McIntosh
 Coburn Hastings (WA) McKeon
 Collins Hayworth Metcalf
 Combust Hefley Mica
 Condit Herger Miller (FL)
 Cook Hill Molinari
 Cooksey Hilleary Moran (KS)
 Cox Hobson Morella
 Cramer Hoekstra Myrick
 Crane Hooley Nethercutt
 Crapo Horn Neumann
 Cubin Hostettler Ney
 Cunningham Houghton Northup
 Hulshof Norwood

Nussle Ros-Lehtinen Stenholm
 Oxley Roukema Stump
 Packard Royce Sununu
 Pappas Ryun Talent
 Parker Salmon Tanner
 Pascrell Sanford Tauscher
 Paul Saxton Tauzin
 Paxon Scarborough Taylor (NC)
 Pease Schaefer, Dan Thomas
 Peterson (MN) Schaffer, Bob Thornberry
 Peterson (PA) Sensenbrenner Thune
 Petri Sessions Tiaht
 Pickering Shadegg Torres
 Pitts Shays Trafficant
 Pomo Shimkus Upton
 Porter Shuster Walsh
 Portman Skeen Wamp
 Pryce (OH) Smith (MI) Watkins
 Quinn Smith (NJ) Watts (OK)
 Radanovich Smith (OR) Weldon (FL)
 Ramstad Smith (TX) Weldon (PA)
 Redmond Smith, Adam Weller
 Regula Smith, Linda Wexler
 Riggs Snowbarger White
 Roemer Solomon Whitfield
 Rogan Souder Wicker
 Rogers Spence Wolf
 Rohrabacher Stearns Young (FL)

NAYS—187

Abercrombie Gejdenson Moakley
 Ackerman Gephardt Mollohan
 Allen Goode Moran (VA)
 Andrews Green Murtha
 Baesler Gutierrez Nadler
 Baldacci Hall (OH) Neal
 Barcia Hall (TX) Oberstar
 Barrett (WI) Hamilton Obey
 Becerra Harman Olver
 Bentsen Hastings (FL) Owens
 Berman Hefner Pallone
 Berry Hilliard Pastor
 Bishop Hinchey Payne
 Blagojevich Hinojosa Pelosi
 Blumenauer Holden Pickett
 Bonior Hoyer Pomeroy
 Borski Istook Poshard
 Boucher Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
 Boyd Jackson-Lee Rahall
 Brown (CA) (TX) Rangel
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Reyes
 Brown (OH) John Rivers
 Capps Johnson (WI) Rodriguez
 Cardin Johnson, E. B. Rothman
 Carson Kanjorski Roybal-Allard
 Christensen Kaptur Rush
 Clay Kennedy (MA) Sabo
 Clayton Kennedy (RI) Sanchez
 Clement Kennelly Sanders
 Clyburn Kildee Sandlin
 Conyers Kilpatrick Sawyer
 Costello Klink Schumer
 Coyne Kucinich Scott
 Cummings LaFalce Serrano
 Davis (FL) Lampson Sherman
 Davis (IL) Lantos Sisisky
 DeFazio Levin Skaggs
 DeGette Lewis (GA) Skelton
 Delahunt Lofgren Slaughter
 DeLauro Lowey Snyder
 Dellums Luther Spratt
 Deutsch Maloney (CT) Stabenow
 Dicks Maloney (NY) Stark
 Dingell Markey Stokes
 Dixon Martinez Strickland
 Doggett Mascara Stupak
 Doolittle Matsui Taylor (MS)
 Doyle McCarthy (MO) Thompson
 Edwards McCarthy (NY) Thurman
 Engel McDermott Tierney
 Eshoo McGovern Towns
 Etheridge McHale Turner
 Evans McIntyre Velazquez
 Farr McKinney Vento
 Fattah McInnis Visclosky
 Fazio Meek Watt (NC)
 Filner Menendez Waxman
 Flake Millender Weygand
 Ford McDonald Wise
 Frank (MA) Miller (CA) Woolsey
 Frost Minge Wynn
 Furse Mink Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Foglietta Lazio Shaw
 Forbes Ortiz Young (AK)
 Gonzalez Riley
 Graham Schiff

□ 1205

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 342, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2015, BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 105-218) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2015) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998. 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 ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by the 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 purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, concerning the time just yielded to the minority, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the standard rule for consideration of a conference report on reconciliation legislation. All points of order are waived against the bill and its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Finally, the rule provides 90 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that we have extended the debate time from the customary 1 hour to 90 minutes in order to maximize the time for

the House to debate this very historic agreement. And when I state "very historic agreement," Mr. Speaker, I want to heap praise on the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who has brought to this floor something that many of us have worked so hard for over all these years. And it could not have happened without the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], certainly his committee, and the staff of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and the crew of Apollo 11 made their famous leap for mankind onto the surface of the Moon. Later that same year, the Federal Government recorded its first balanced budget in a decade, an actual budget surplus of \$300 million. Both are milestones, Mr. Speaker, because the budget has not been balanced since that time back in 1969.

In fact, in 1997, the Government spent over \$6,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. And that is up from \$500 in 1960. Each person's share of that national debt is more than \$14,500, and that is up from \$1,300 in 1960. This goes to show us what has happened over the years.

And even worse, the Federal Government is three times larger than in 1960, and the tax burden is unconscionable on the American people, particularly middle-class American people, who make up the real backbone of this Nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, this Republican Congress and President Clinton will stem the tide of this rising sea of red ink, and it will stop the growth of Government. Today, the Republican Congress will deliver America's working families the first balanced budget in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues recall, in 1994, when the American people gave Republicans control of the people's House, we pledged to balance the budget. Today, we deliver on that promise.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, this body has debated balanced budgets many times over the last few years, but today's debate is special. It represents a historic achievement for the future benefit of America's children, for their families and for the economy of this Nation. For today we do not just debate a balanced budget, we actually deliver one for the American people, what they have been asking of this body for so many years now.

This endeavor proves that Congress, working with the administration, can achieve common goals without compromising fundamental principles, showing the American people that we can work together to solve problems, and the American people are applauding this every day now since we came to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud to inform the American people that our democratic process, something that

has been maligned in recent years, is working. This democratic process, even with the Congress and with a President of opposing parties has produced a bipartisan balanced budget agreement that cuts taxes for the first time in 16 years, that preserves Medicare and protects it from bankruptcy into the 21st century, that slows the growth of total Federal spending to 3 percent a year. That is no easy task. And that shifts power, money and influence away from Washington and to the people in the States and communities.

Mr. Speaker, while this is a bipartisan agreement, it is useful to recognize just how far we have come. Just 4 years ago, this Congress under a Democrat majority passed the largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America. Today we cut the tax burden on American families for every single working American in this country.

Just 4 years ago, Mr. Speaker, this Congress expanded new entitlement programs and they increased spending by tens of billions of dollars. What is different today? Today we slow the growth of entitlement spending. Today we increase budget enforcement, and today we actually reduce Federal spending to 18.9 percent of the Gross Domestic Product by the year 2002. That will be the first time since 1974, 25 years ago, that spending has fallen below 20 percent of the GDP.

Mr. Speaker, just 4 years ago this Congress passed increased Government spending packages. Today we make the Federal Government smaller, allowing the free market to provide the stimulus for the economy to create long-term job growth. Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican Congress has made to the economy.

Since the 1994 election, the Dow Jones Industrial Average has more than doubled from 3,900 points to 8,100 points, interest rates have dropped from 8 percent to 6 percent, and 6.4 million new jobs have been created. The economy is growing because taxes, spending, and the Government are not growing.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not here today to only look at the past or even the present but to the future of this great country. The balanced budget we debate here today is built on a solid foundation of programmatic and economic assumptions, a foundation that will generate benefits to American working families for years to come. This is a package that will keep on delivering financial relief to families and to businesses in the form of lower taxes, lower interest rates, higher job growth and a stronger economy, and we are locking it all into law so that it has to happen.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in my district in upstate New York, a balanced budget will significantly enhance the opportunities of working families to care for their children and to help their communities. Alan Greenspan, greatly respected by both sides of the aisle,